PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT

PROCEEDINGS
of the
1983 ANNUAL JOINT MEETING
with the
ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL OF ALBERTA

8, 9, 10 December 1983 Banff, Alberta

Alberta
ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL OF ALBERTA

Copies of this
report may be obtained
upon request to

Environment Council of Alberta
8th Floor Weber Centre
5555 Calgary Trail Southbound NW
Edmonton, Alberta
T6H 5P9

ECA84-PA/AR

CONTENTS

PROCEEDINGS

Evening Session, December 8, 1983

Official Opening 1
Dr. Guy Swinnerton 1
Theme Speakers 3
Dr. George Priddle 3
Mr. Denis Moffat 10
Mr. Donn Cline 15
Question Period 21

Morning Session, December 9, 1983

Official Opening 27
Mr. Joe Shemanchuk 27
PAC Chairman's Remarks 27
Mr. Joe Shemanchuk 27
Welcome from the Town of Banff 27
Mr. Jim Vollmershausen 27
Welcome from the ECA 28
Mr. Alistair Crerar 28
Introduction of Theme Speakers 28
Mrs. Dorothy Broadbent 28
Tourism and the National Parks 30
Mr. Steve Kun 30
Dr. Bruce Leeson 34
Mr. Jim Vollmershausen 38
Mr. Dave Morrisson 42
Question Period 44
Resolutions, Part I 50
Chairman Mr. Bob Richardson 50
Resolution 2 52
Resolution 3 52
Resolution 4 52
Resolution 5 53
Resolution 6 53
Resolution 7 54
Resolution 1 58
Resolution 8 58

Afternoon Session, December 9, 1983
Introduction of Theme Speakers 58
Dr. Sheri Dalton 58
Outdoor Recreation – Agencies and Their Responsibilities 59
Mr. Barry Rogers 59
Mr. Bill Shaw 67
Ms. Jan Bloomfield 71
Question Period 77
Introduction of Theme Speakers 83
Dr. Charlie Wood 83
Water Based Recreation 84
Mr. Ted Dykstra 84
Mr. Glen Clements 92
Mr. Elmer Kure 96
Mr. Cliff Lacey 100
Morning Session, December 10, 1983
Report of the Co-ordinating Committee 108
Mr. Joe Shemanchuk 108
Report of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee 108
Dr. Julien Guay 108
Report of the Science Advisory Committee 109
Dr. Dixon Thompson 109
Report of the Membership Committee 110
Mr. Bill Flook 110
Report of the Energy Study Group 111
Dr. Ridley Shaw 111
Report of the Environment Protection Study Group 112
Dr. Guy Swinnerton 112
Report of the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group 113
Mrs. Betty Hunter 113
Report of the Pollution Study Group 113
Dr. Lub Wojtiw 113
Report of the Renewable Resources Study Group 113
Dr. Charlie Wood 113
Report of the Urban Environment Study Group 114
Mrs. Jean Sloan 114
Report of the ECA Research Division 114
Mr. Dave Buchwald 114
Report of the Nominating Committee 116
Mr. Ron Whitstance-Smith 116

Introduction of Theme Speakers 118
Ms. Louise Horstman 118
Recreation-Related Environmental Problems in the Green Zone 118
Mr. Paul Short 118
Ms. Diane Pachal 122
Mr. Eric Butters 126
Question Period 128
Afternoon Session, December 10, 1983
Luncheon Address 137
Mr. Alistair Crerar 137
Question Period 140
Thankyou to Luncheon Speaker 142
Dr. Martha Kostuch 142
Resolutions, Part II 142
Chairman Mr. Bob Richardson 142
Resolution 5 143
Energy Study Group Status 143
Evening Session, December 10, 1983
Introduction of Guest Speaker 149
Mr. Alistair Crerar 149
Guest Speaker 149
The Hon. Fred Bradley 149
Question Period 152
Thankyou to Guest Speaker 163
Ms. Louise Horstman 164
APPENDICES
Membership of the Public Advisory Committees 165
Agenda for the Annual Joint Meeting 167
Attendees at the Annual Joint Meeting 172
Resolutions 173
Resolution 1 173
Resolution 2 173
Resolution 3 174
Resolution 4 175
Resolution 5 176
Resolution 6 176
Resolution 7 177
Resolution 8 178

Minutes of Meetings with the Minister 179
Meeting of Wednesday, January 12, 1983 179
Meeting of Thursday, June 30, 1983 180
Annual Reports of the Public Advisory Committees 181
The Co-ordinating Committee 181
The Environmental Education Advisory Committee 182
The Science Advisory Committee 183
The Membership Committee 184
The Energy Study Group 185
The Environment Protection Study Group 186
The Non-Renewable Resources Study Group 187
The Pollution Study Group 189
The Renewable Resources Study Group 190
The Urban Environment Study Group 191
The ECA Research Division 193

The following Court Reporter's transcript of the Proceedings is presented unedited and unchanged as submitted.

Editor

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON

EVENING SESSION - 8:00 P.M.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we will try and start now, please. Thank you.

My name is Guy Swinnerton, I am the Chairman for this opening session. I won't delay on extensive introductions and speeches of welcome, because we have the official opening tomorrow morning. Let me just take a moment to say on behalf of the Committee that planned this year's conference that we welcome you here to what I think is a very interesting and timely and topical theme, that of parks and outdoor recreation. Notwithstanding the fact that if we didn't have that area of interest, I would be out of a job at the University of Alberta.

Besides that, there are a number of issues which we will be discussing over the next couple of days which are extremely important. While I don't want to take any of the thunder of our guest speakers this evening, or indeed subsequent speakers over the next couple of days, I think it might be useful just to glance at one or two items which you should try and keep in mind, and which we as a Planning Committee for the conference try to build into the conference theme and subtheme.

I think that most of us are aware of the increasing importance of all outdoor recreation and participation therein, and even though we might not spend a great proportion of our leisure time away from our home environment, that part that we do being extremely important to us in terms of characterizing our lifestyle, and that is one reason I think our topic is appropriate.

Secondly, I think you are all well aware of the changing economic circumstances which affect us, and not less, the whole situation with regard to the delivery of outdoor recreation in the outdoor system. I think in this regard most agencies, both in Alberta and across Canada, and indeed in many other countries for that matter, are becoming

increasingly cognizant of the need to develop policy goals and objectives which really set out, both for their own staff and other government agencies, and indeed the public at large, exactly where they are going with regards to outdoor recreation and park provision.

I think in Alberta, and once again I think we might draw parallels with other provinces, one of the problems that agencies face in grappling with the delivery system is the fact that so many agencies are involved either in the preliminary or in most instances the second or tertiary mandate in terms of helping to provide us with those outdoor recreation opportunities. And so as you see from some of the sessions that we have lined up for you over the next couple of days, one of our intents is to try and make you aware of the diversity of agencies which have some involvement in this exercise.

Also I think it is timely because we are increasingly seeing questioning of the role of recreation and like agencies in terms of where they stand in reconciling in terms of the dilemma between recreation provisions and conservation. And I think this is another item which no doubt our speakers this evening will address and will come up again during the next couple of days.

When we, as a conference committee, sat down and thought about the conference theme and the subjects and who we would have to address it, we thought it would be appropriate for the first evening to be able to stand back and look at circumstances, not only here in Alberta, but in some of the other provinces across Canada in terms of how they are doing with the recreation and park issue. The intent of the session this evening is not to end up with giving points to Alberta, or giving points to B.C., or giving points to Ontario in terms of who has the best system, because I'm sure our speakers will indicate that while there are similarities in the problems they face, there are nuances which are pretty much tied to their particular

provincial characteristics.

I think we have got an excellent panel here this evening to address this whole issue of provincial parks prospectives. Now we will handle this session is that I intend to introduce our three speakers, they will each address us for approximately 20 minutes, and then before opening it up for general discussion I will ask each of them if they'd like to respond or react to any of the comments that the other panel members have made. I will then open it up for general discussion. Could I remind you at this point in time that when you do address questions to the panel it will be helpful if you will perhaps mention the particular individual to whom you are addressing that question, and more particularly, as far as recording the proceedings, would you identify yourself by name and also which study group you represent.

Without any further comments, let me introduce our speakers, as I say, we have representatives from our own province here of Alberta, also from Ontario and from B.C. Could I say, in that regard, we specifically looked to B.C. and Ontario in terms of sending representatives, in the sense that they have gone through a number of interesting changes of late, and I think it would be useful to all of us here in this room to have some input from them in terms of what they have done, the rationale for what they have done in this regard, and perhaps we can benefit in some way from their experience.

On my immediate left I have Dr. George Priddle from Ontario, a graduate in geography from the University of Western Ontario, subsequently M.A.'s and Ph.D's in resource management from Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. He has taught during his academic career both at Loyola University, which I think is mainly known for its long association with the University of Waterloo, where he is currently Chairman of the Department of Man-Environmental Studies. His other particular qualifications which make him particularly well suited for this evening's topic is the fact

that during the period 1965 to 1983 he was Chairman of the Ontario Parks Council. I think in this regard he can bring us an interesting mix of insights from the academic as well as a strong involvement with the actual delivery of the parks system in Ontario.

To his left in the middle of the three gentlemen is Denis Moffat, who is currently Manager of Planning and Research in the British Columbia Parks. He graduated from MacMaster University, then joined the Conservation Authorities Branch in the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, worked as a recreation planner with those authorities until 1971, when he joined the Manitoba Parks Branch as their senior recreational planner. He has also served as Director of Parks in Manitoba from 1976 to 1980, at which time he continued his migration west to B.C., and for the last two years was Director of Outdoor Recreation Branch Parks, Outdoor Recreation Division, Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing. Just to complicate things further, he, almost in the eleventh hour, assumed a new position as Manager of Planning and Research of British Columbia Parks, because of the organization lately in that province.

On the very far left we have Donn Cline, who is Assistant Deputy Minister of Design Implementation Division with Alberta Recreation and Parks. Donn Cline is a native of Edmonton, Alberta, although he has had extensive experience with the Parks Service right across Canada. He graduated in forest conservation from the University of Manitoba, and then followed with a Master of Science degree from the State University of New York at Syracuse. He has worked with Canada's National Park Service, beginning as a Park Ranger in Jasper National Park, has worked out of Ottawa in research into national park proposals and for six years worked for the Manitoba Provincial Park Agency. Seven years ago he moved back to Edmonton as Director of Parks Planning for the Alberta Provincial Park, and as I say, he was appointed Assistant Deputy for Design and Implementation recently.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Priddle)

In that regard, I think by those background notes you can see that we have got a well informed panel who can address a variety of issues, and without further adieu, I will ask Dr. George Priddle to commence the proceedings by telling us something about the Ontario Provincial Park system.

DR. PRIDDLE: I will try to be as brief as I can, but I will forewarn you, professors are programmed for 50 minutes. We had a roast for a retiring colleague of mine a few weeks ago and we told everybody they had seven minutes, and at 2 o'clock in the morning we were still sitting there. I am certainly not here from Ontario to tell you how to run Alberta, that is a very nasty thing that a lot of Ontarioans are guilty of. I am here more to tell you of our experience that we have had, and I think there is a lot you can learn from it, maybe more in the way of negative lessons than positive lessons, things to avoid.

Talking about people advising other people reminds me of the story of the Catholic boy and the Jewish boy walking down the street and arguing over which one has the best religion, and finally the Catholic boy says well I think our priests are a lot smarter than your rabbis, to which the Jewish boy replied, "They should be, you tell them everything."

Up until last June, Ontario had 131 provincial parks; last June, on June 3rd to be exact, the Minister of Natural Resources of the Province of Ontario announced the establishment of 155 new parks to encompass over 3,000,000 acres. This is quite an accomplishment, and what I am basically going to be talking about tonight is not so much the establishment of the first 131, but how in the last three years we managed to get an additional 155; it was a lot of hard sludging and it's quite a story.

In fact, if it hadn't been for a great deal of pushing and pulling and conniving by people like yourselves with like interests, both inside and outside of government, and in and outside of the corridors of the Legislature, it never would have happened. And in fact, I think a very good friend of

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Priddle)

mine who was on the Ontario Parks Council with me, an historian, who has just written a book on the history of Ontario Provincial Parks, and what that book shows very clearly is that wherever we have got a significant park in Ontario, even in the original 131, it was because an individual or a group of individuals from the public pushed very hard for that to happen.

Even in the case of Algonquin Park, which was really our first big park in Ontario, if you read all the plaques in the park, it looks like it was conceived and is there because of some civil servants. The truth of the matter is, and what was uncovered in the research of Professor Killam, is the fact that it was a group of concerned citizens who thought it should be set aside as a park, and that was the real catalyst for it happening.

So just for review, very very briefly, the early days Algonquin Park was one of the very first big parks on the eastern side of North America outside of Adirondack State Park in upstate New York that was established, and it was established in 1893. 1894 we got Rondeau, which is a peninsular park in Lake Erie, again that was because of a group of people in Chatham pushing very hard for it to happen. We got six in the next 50 years, Quetico which was one of our first big wilderness parks in Northwestern Ontario and on the Minnesota border in 1909. Then Long Point, a provincial park in Lake Erie in 1921, Presqu'ile in 1921, Ipplewash in 1938 and so on. So it was relatively slow.

Then there was a hiatus there, a lack of parks establishment during the war years and so on, and accelerating tremendously from 1954 to 1964, we added 81 parks to the system and 55 park reserves. From 1965 to 1975 we added another ten parks.

In the early '60's, people were beginning to realize however that we had more than just a bunch of parks. We had a lot of parks that were very different from each other and required very different planning management regimes and very

different thinking, and yet there was a tendency to manage them all with very much the same formula. Because of that realization that we came up for a classification for parks, and we began to realize that we did have a system of parks. And in fact, we were beginning to have very real management problems, particularly in big parks like Algonquin where a park where we tried to run on a local use concept was running into real problems. We were beginning to have conflicts between recreationists, canoe trippers and loggers. As long as we kept them away from the park we were okay, but when people began to see the logging trucks rolling over the portages, there was a great deal of unhappiness, which of course hit the Globe and Mail and there was much to-do about it.

Also we began more subtly to have problems between the recreationists, especially with motorboats we weren't mixing very well with the people who were supposedly there on a wilderness canoe trip. So we really started doing our management planning for Algonquin Park in the early '60's. So it was really Algonquin Park that had the first master plan, and it was a long time in the making. But I think we learned a great deal from that master planning exercise.

Meanwhile, internally in the government, particularly in the early '70's, we were beginning to think about what we call systems planning, and that was more than just having classifications to say we have different kinds of parks, we have to go farther than that. We had to say, "What do we really want?" Ideally if we were to have our way, how many parks would we have out there, where would they be, how would they be managed, what would be their function and how would they be managed. And out of that same kind of thinking came a system of parks for the Province of Ontario, at least on paper. We recognized that the need for wilderness parks was for a very large park for relatively back country type use, that we should have a system of nature reserves primarily to maintain biological diversity, a representative system of

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Priddle)

natural landscapes; and we would have natural environment parks which would be large parks run more like a multiple use type of park like Algonquin. That we needed more recreational parks, mainly beaches and campgrounds near where people live, or where they were travelling. Then we should have a system of historical parks that represent significant historical landscapes that preserve our history; and also that we should have a system of waterway parks, and by waterway parks, they meant what the Americans call wild river parks. It was a concept that was expanded to include not only the wild rivers, but also rivers that were important because of their historical and recreational value as well.

So we developed this system of parks with these various types of parks in it, and we also developed again on paper a zoning system for various types of zones that you would find in these various types of parks.

The most difficult task in all this thinking was starting to determine what kind of recreational activities, or any kind of activities, human activity was appropriate in a particular zone in a particular park, and that of course, is still not totally figured out and one that we still have to wrestle with. Things like obviously logging is not appropriate in wilderness zones in a natural environment park, motorboats were not appropriate in a wilderness park or in a wilderness zone of another park.

Once we started thinking that all through, and decided what was appropriate where, then a long way down the line we had to suggest how we are going to manage the places, again to see where the anomalies were. There were a lot of things happening in a lot of parks that really didn't fit with their theory about how parks ought to be operated. For example, in many parks of Ontario, particularly the peninsular parks in Lake Ontario and Erie, hunting is allowed even in the national parks or Point Pelee, and of course that goes very much against the edicts, policy, the thinking of park service people. But in many instances, they had to come to grips

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Priddle)

with that, because it had already been put in regulation and legislation.

Another point that became significant about this time, we were about to issue a series of Green Papers which showed this thinking in 1965, but what they conceived of is a system of parks, and they were also about ready to issue the master plan for Algonquin Park, which was their first attempt at coming up with a master plan for a big park.

In the Park Act, it allows them to have citizen participation and public input to this kind of decision making, or to this kind of parkland planning management. So it was at that time that myself and my colleagues on the Park Council came into existence because the government decided to establish what it called the Ontario Park Council, which was a body, not unlike your own, advisory body to the government, particularly to the Minister of Natural Resources on parks and park related matters. That was a very interesting experience for me as I found myself in a forum not unlike you find yourselves in this evening.

The initial job we were charged with was overseeing the implementation of the Algonquin Park master plan. The government knew they couldn't win on that one, because there was a whole body of people out there that said there should be no logging allowed in Algonquin Park. There was another whole body of people out there that said logging must continue to protect their jobs in the neighboring communities. The government had taken a middle of the road position in allowing logging under certain controlled conditions, and they knew they couldn't win on that one, they were probably just going to make everybody mad. So the least they could do politically was take the process over and continue to hear from people on a regular review basis about what they thought of the Algonquin Park master plan and how it was working.

So that was one of the very first and the main reasons that the Park Council came into existence. The second one was, of course, that they were ready to table a series of

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Priddle)

Green Papers, one on each type of park, on the wildlife parks, wilderness parks and so on. It suggests what these things were, how many they have got today and how they ought to be managed. And the Green Papers were papers of course, which solicits public response before you finally come out with your policy. So it was our job to take those Green Papers to the public, solicit their response, get their feedback, adjust them accordingly, and send recommendations to the Minister.

I must say, he responded very favorably to much of the recommendations coming from the public that had filtered through us, and they were absorbed and incorporated into what finally became park policy, and what is now known in Ontario as the Blue Book, simply because it came out without anybody's name on it and had a blue cover.

We then had the Council begin travelling around the province, and this is where the job got very interesting, going to various parts of the Province of Ontario, particularly where new master plans for parks were coming onstream. The next one after Algonquin was Lake Superior just outside of Sault Ste. Marie, and then we went out to Quetico on the Minnesota border just west of Thunder Bay, and some of these things almost became bizarre because we would go to these meetings, and I will never forget the night in Atikokan where we had public meetings to present and hear responses from the people on the Quetico master plan. The problem was nobody had it, including ourselves, and as governments are prone to do sometimes, they had a little trouble getting it out on time. Suddenly some guy came rushing in to the back of the room with this box that he had stolen off the back of a postage truck, or a mail truck, full of these master plans and said, "We're not going to hold up this meeting because the plans aren't here, I just went and stole them", so some guy whom nobody had ever seen before was distributing master plans that not even the people in the government had seen before. So we had some rather bizarre evenings.

But out of those evenings we think we learned an awful lot, not only about the people of Ontario, but how they relate to their landscapes. As a result of getting involved in a great many and a great broad number of issues, anybody who ever spoke to the Park Council, be it by a phone call or a written letter or a submission or an oral presentation in a meeting like this, was asked to leave their name and address and we kept them in communication with what we were doing. We sent out annual reports every year and for as long as they wanted them. So we started developing quite a large community of interest of people who were concerned for whatever reason with our park system.

Some of the issues, and I will just list them, some of the issues we talked about over the years in our work with the Council were problems of Crown lands recreation, the problems of people going into areas of Crown land or public land that weren't in any way controlled by any kind of a park group. Of course this became the problem of garbage, the problems of Americans coming in and hunting and fishing and not leaving any money there, all of these things were of very great concern particularly to the people of Northern Ontario.

The problem of native rights, the Indians were constantly showing up at our meetings saying we can't hunt and fish there because we have got this treaty that we signed with Queen Victoria that says we can, and of course you know how much in Canada that struggle still goes on. We also had a lot of problems, particularly in the southern parks of rowdyism. The 24th of May weekends in some of our provincial parks became classic, particularly places like Wasaga Beach on the shores of Lake Huron, where on the 24th of May weekend everybody goes bananas and the place really gets torn apart, and all sorts of people get badly frightened by the experience of being in our parks on the 24th of May weekend. So we were asked to address that problem.

Outboard motors in Algonquin Park, the fishermen were still allowed, particularly in the spring, to go into the

interior of the park with outboard motors and it was making all of the canoe groups anxious, and this is one of the toughest problems we had to come to grips with was the problem of outboard motors. If you want to talk to me about any of these things afterwards you can.

The adequacy of our park legislation was questioned many times, and we ended up redrafting the legislation and presenting it to government. The whole problem of deregulation, for a while the government was extremely concerned, and I think they still are concerned about too much regulation and how can we deregulate. Privatization, the need to take some parks because the government was cutting back, as you are experiencing out here now, and so they were talking about actually contracting out the maintenance of some of the smaller parks to the private sector. The whole question of mining in the parks and when, if ever, and under what conditions. The whole question of tourism, or how to promote tourism, particularly from outside of the province, and if you do, how do you control that impact from becoming too great. The whole question of visitor services, how much should the parks do for the people; should they tell them about nature, okay, should they be telling them about canoeing, should they be teaching them how to canoe. You know, how far do you go with the whole visitor services thing.

The whole question of volunteers, when do you use volunteers, how do you use volunteers. The whole question of the occupier and the law is the title we used, the whole question of people using private lands for recreation. When do you let them on, under what conditions, is legislation adequate, how do you post land to tell people what they can do on private land, and that was a very interesting session as well.

Play areas in parks, how much do you provide in the way of apparatus and playgrounds in developed parks.

Then finally one of the last things that we did when I was involved with Council was a full-scale review of the

Algonquin Park master plan, and that was five years after the fact, we took a very hard look at the plan and reviewed it and went back to the public with a series of documents about what still seemed to be the issues, and again sought your input and recommended changes in it.

A few of the things I think we did reasonably well on the Council, I notice here your excellent publications out at the desk of which I have taken advantage; we produced annual reports like this every year. The good thing I think about our annual reports was number one, they were sent to everybody who had spoken to us during that year. So number one, they could see whether it had had any impact on us at all and what that impact had been. The recommendations of the Parks Council on every issue they addressed that year were in the annual report, and it was sent to the Minister. The latter versions of the annual reports in the last few years that I was involved with it, not only were the recommendations of the Council in there, but also the responses of the Minister. We had issues, recommendations, Minister's response, which maybe got rejected or accepted, or take it under advisement.

Anyway, we got five annual reports out from 1975 to 1979, unfortunately there is not a 6, 7th or 8th annual report, and let me explain what happened. Black clouds were building on the horizon in Ontario in about 1979, Bill Davis had called an election and was once more re-elected with his "big blue machine", our Minister at that time was Jimmy Auld, and he decided to go back to Brockville to stay, he wasn't going to run again, he had been in the Cabinet for 20 years. The Deputy Minister, Keith Reynolds, retired, and they put a guy in charge of the Ministry of Natural Resources named Bill Foster, who everybody in the Government of Ontario knows when it came to Parks he was probably public enemy number one. In fact, when he first spoke to the Parks Council and we expressed some of our concerns about the implementation of the park policy, he interrupted our presentation to say,

"Ladies and gentlemen, you must realize that the main function of the Minister of Natural Resources in the Province of Ontario is to get the fiber to the mill."

So we realized his mandate was also Fish and Wildlife and all of these things, but he obviously had his priorities very much in place. So at that point, I announced to the Council that they were talking to the enemy, and that was the end of our discussions with the Deputy.

About that time when one of my last tasks with the Parks Council was to run a park conference at the University of Waterloo, that was going to be jointly sponsored by the Minister of Natural Resources and the University of Waterloo. And the result of that conference, if you are interested, came out in a news publication called "Environment". And what looked to be just another dry conference turned out to be a very lively conference, because after the Deputy Minister had visited us and we had this terrible experience, the Council got very irate and upset, and we blew the lid off. We went to the CBC, we went to Don Harron, and got a lot of great coverage from the media about what was happening in the M.N.R., and why the park program was in real difficulty.

Let me explain a little bit why it was in difficulty, for ten years in Ontario we have been doing something called S.L.U.P., which means Strategic Land Use Planning, which is an attempt to come out with a comprehensive land use plan for Crown land, particularly in Northern Ontario. What would happen, of course, when we started doing that, we started looking at all the policies of the miners and the park people and the foresters; the foresters didn't realize that they were in very great difficulty because they would not have enough land if we gave it all to them because they are overcutting at a rapid rate, not practicing sustained yield, the forest is disappearing very, very quickly, as is very well documented, and so they were in real difficulty. So suddenly to the forester people interested in parks were right up there with pests, disease and fires, and we were

part of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse as far as the timber guys were concerned. And of course, the head timber guy was now running the Ministry, there was no Minister in place, and the Deputy was the biggest bark shipper in the province.

So the conference again was very lively, a couple of civil servants lost their jobs over it, a lot of people spoke out much more than possibly should have. Anyway, what happened, Davis got re-elected, they kept Bill Foster as the Deputy Minister, but the ray of light at the end of the tunnel came shining through in the form of a man named Alan Pope, who was a northerner from Timmins, and a very good and bright star in Davis' Cabinet. And he has done an excellent job in my personal opinion, as the Minister of Natural Resources, and in fact he has been a match for his Deputy Minister, which is quite a challenge. He said let's look at the Strategic Land Use Planning process, you guys have been at it for ten years, he said, that is it, you have got one year to finish it. Of course everybody started tearing their hair and saying they couldn't do it, and he said you will do it or you won't have a job. Suddenly we had a Strategic Land Use Plan for 46 districts in Ontario.

The Strategic Land Use Plans created quite a bit of concern, because when they first came out at a kind of a province-wide level, maps started appearing showing where we proposed to put the wilderness parks, where we proposed to put the waterway parks, and of course this made the Ontario Forestry very mad, and the battle started taking place, not only in public forum, but also in the inner Cabinet of the government. Quite a struggle went on in the Cabinet between the Minister of Northern Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources about the Strategic Land Use Plan.

In spite of all that, I might just mention that in the public forum there are a number of people who worked very, very hard, particularly a guy named Bill Addison from Northern Ontario and Arlin Hackman from Southern Ontario,

organizing a group that later became known as The Coalition, and this was a bunch of non-government organizations like the National and Provincial Parks Association, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists had banned together to make good public input in 47 different districts of the province as to why the park policy should be implemented and those parks should be realized on paper.

Of course they weren't the only ones who were putting pressure on government, the Ontario Forest Industries Association put pressure on government in the other direction. Alan Pope gathered all the action groups and pressure groups together at the eleventh hour on the land use plan exercise, and made the statement that he was very impressed with the Parks people who were the only ones who were prepared to compromise and negotiate. That all the other interest groups seemed to be strictly posturing, and they weren't prepared to do anything in any kind of an integrated or coalescing way.

There was a great deal of concern at the end of the Strategic Land Use Planning process as well about the adequacy of the public participation process. Alan Pope felt that his people hadn't done as good a job as they might have in that regard, and personally went around on one instance with a pad and pencil, and at eight different meetings talked to 3500 people inside of two weeks about how they were feeling about the whole exercise. He worked very, very hard as a Minister, and really did a lot of changes in all 47 district plans, or asked some very hard questions about them. The result of all this was that on June 3rd, he announced the publishing of the Land Use Plan, and we got 155 new parks. Now five of them are large new wilderness parks, one is the expansion of a wilderness park that was too small, and we got 25 wild river parks, over 75 nature reserves, and a slew of natural environment and recreational parks.

So that is the good news. If you are interested in the details of that, I brought some maps that we smuggled out of

Toronto that aren't public yet, that show the existing parks and the proposed parks, and that may change, and that is why you are not supposed to have the maps. Anyway, if you have a minute you can see them.

So that is the good news. There is still, I wouldn't say bad news, but there is still a lot of concern out there in kind of the future sense. One is the basic legislative concern. A number of studies have come out in Ontario that show that in the north particularly we don't use all the enabling legislation that would control land use that we have on the books. About the only thing that we use is the Lands Act, which is a relatively new piece of legislation. We totally ignore, for example, the Environmental Assessment Act, which is a rather good piece of legislation.

My own personal concern is that although we have got an announcement of 155 new parks, I'm not sure that we will get them in regulation, getting parks in regulation is difficult, and I think that is going to be particularly difficult because we are at a time of tremendous cutbacks in government, the park budget has been severely slashed and they just don't know where they will get all this money to make it all happen. Also I am still concerned that the corporate will of government will be strong enough to make it last, and I think it will be again very much of a non-government organization and advisory groups to continue the pressure to make sure that what we said gets to happen.

Let's just look for a minute at the corporate response, or the government response, we have done some very good things. The big buzz word in Ontario right now is integrative, in other words let's really work together, we haven't been doing that very well to make these things happen. One of the things that they haven't been doing very well, as I just mentioned in another context, was work within the Environmental Assessment Act with for example our park plans or for forest management plans. They are now coming out with what they call environmental assessment for forest management

plans, and environmental assessment for park management plans. So they are putting that park and land planning under the umbrella of environmental assessment. So hopefully we will get a much better environmentally sound and accountable planning and management. So that is happening, and it is happening right now.

Even with that, the non-government organizations will not be very happy because they will see, even with putting them under the environment assessment they probably haven't gone far enough in doing what a lot of them felt was holistic planning and monitoring of what the effect of all these things are.

The real challenge, and what can be said in conclusion, is that the Minister of Natural Resources of Ontario has come a long way, particularly with the Parks people within the organization, considering the tremendous forces that were working against them. I think there is still a tremendous challenge upon them to get the job done, and there is still a tremendous challenge to the people outside of government, be they within academic or non-academic or non-government positions to continue to work on research that shows how you go about this so-called ecosystem, or ecological planning, and more importantly, how to show that it pays. I am convinced that it does pay, and makes economic good sense, but if you can't show the bottom line of these things today, you are going to have a very hard time selling them.

With Donn Cline, I was a year ago in October at the Third World Conference on parks in Bali, Indonesia, and the theme of that conference was "Parks for Sustainable Development". I think that idea comes up very much out of the developing world, of course, where they can't get a park which is in a pretty wilderness site, they have to show due cause for why you need a park and what and how it is actually going to show a role in a positive environmental concept, whether it is the headwaters of a stream or whatever. And I think when we come around to that kind of thinking, "parks

as a sustainable development", we will have come a long way and we can talk effectively with the other land managers. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Thank you, Dr. Priddle. I would now like to call on Denis Moffat to make his presentation. Denis?

MR. MOFFAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, your introductory remarks were very interesting, and hit home, especially the emphasis placed on the importance of outdoor recreation and the provision about our recreation opportunities. From a personal point of view, it is also interesting to note that I am the Director, or the former Director of the former Outdoor Recreation Branch of the Province of British Columbia, which branch disappeared virtually at the stroke of a pen a month and a half ago. While the functions of that organization have not disappeared, being integrated with other areas of the Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division, personally I think it is a shame that that kind of focus had disappeared from the recreation scene in British Columbia.

However, my comments this evening are going to be addressed to the B.C. Park System, and differing somewhat from what Dr. Priddle -- I am going to go through, I suppose, in a very broad sense, some policy legislation, or legislative manners in which parks are established, or may be established, how we are doing, and what some of the problems facing us are. I suspect in the latter half of the speech you will detect a high degree of similarity between the points that Dr. Priddle just went through, and the points that I am going to go through, and I'm sure when Donn Cline stands up, you will be hearing the same litany. In terms of your advisory role, pay heed to the important ones in their respective lists of problems.

In British Columbia, provincial parks are established at the provision of the Ministry of Lands, Parks and Housing

Act, as well as the Park Act, and one of the stated purposes of the Ministry, stated legislatively, is to encourage outdoor recreation, to establish parks and conserve the natural scenic and historic features of the province. This purpose is further amplified in the Park Act, in that government is directed to ensure the total area of designated parks is never less than, and here I have a problem, do you want it in hectares or acres? Well, 2,550,000 hectares or six million three hundred some odd thousand acres. The stated purpose for provincial parks is that under the authority of the Provincial Park Act, branches to designator and Minister, a system of land and water based areas containing elements of the province's natural and cultural heritage for the enjoyment and inspiration and recreational use of all British Columbians and visitors to the province.

I think there are a couple of important things to note in that stated purpose as it refers to land and water, it refers to natural and cultural heritage, it refers to recreation in a broad sense, and it refers to tourism; and that is quite a package for one agency to handle.

To accomplish this, a number of goals have been stated, these are written goals, written in the policy statements, including to protect those unique, special and outstanding features of the best representative landscape examples of natural heritage significance. To provide an adequate and equitable distribution of areas to meet the diverse and changing outdoor recreation requirements of the public, and to ensure appropriate access to and within these areas. It is interesting to note that appropriate has not been defined. To administer and operate all areas as designated under the Park Act for public benefit and use. And how are these all to be accomplished?

Again, under the Park Act, provincial parks may be established and designated in a number of ways. The Act itself establishes five classes of provincial parks. These are Class A parks, Class B parks, Class C parks, provincial

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

recreation areas and nature conservancy. In addition, Parks Branch parks may be authorized to manage and administer land under the Environment and Land Use Act, the Green Belt Act, the Heritage Conservation Act, the Ecological Reserves Act, or its trails, paths and waterways under the Land Act. Or, land based or rented to the Crown for purposes of outdoor recreation.

The broad classifications of Class A, B and C recreation area and nature conservancy established certain parameters with regard to the alienation of land and the protection or utilization of resources. Theoretically in Class A parks, no interest in land or natural resources, except fish and wildlife, and then under authorized permits, i.e. hunting and fishing licenses, may be alienated or harvested except by permit which will be issued only when deemed necessary for the preservation or maintenance of the recreation values of the park.

In Class B park a very subtle difference, again land will be alienated and resources harvested only when these actions will not be detrimental to the recreational value of the parks. One, they won't be allowed unless they are required for the preservation and maintenance, and the other they will be allowed where they are not detrimental to recreation values; think about that one for a while and try to manage it.

In recreation areas, land may be leased but not sold, resources may be harvested under permit provided recreation use is not restricted, prevented or inhibited. Part of the problem facing B.C. parks now is what is the difference between a Class B park and a recreation area; virtually none according to these terms of reference. As a result, no Class B parks have been established for the last 23 years.

Class C parks are primarily local parks, administered by the local Parks Board, appointed by the Minister, and in which land or resources can be sold or alienated. Virtually they do not form part of the park system.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

Nature conservancies are established within existing parks or recreation areas, and resources may not be sold, removed, harvested or exploited. In essence, the nature conservancies become the wilderness areas.

In summary, the Class A parks are protected; Class B parks are ignored; recreation area designation allows resource extraction provided recreation values are not disrupted, and nature conservancies are inviolate.

As I have noted previously, the key mandates of the provincial parks system are to protect and present representative landscapes on a fair and equitable basis to residents or visitors to the province. To accomplish this, a set of guiding principles have been established within the branch. These take the form of conservation and recreation goal statements. There are four stated conservation goals: the provincial park system will include conserved areas that are representative of natural regions and natural region landscapes of the province. The park system will contain a selection of the best provincial outdoor recreational resources, wilderness areas and scenic resources of the regional landscapes of B.C.

The system will protect and present internationally significant natural features, and the system will contain and present historical resources and themes associated with the regional landscapes of the province.

With regard to the recreational opportunity goals, the following have been established: the park system will provide a network of outdoor recreation opportunities on a provincial calibre for residents, and these will be distributed according to population, resources and resident travel patterns. The system will provide a network of outdoor recreation opportunities of provincial, national and international calibre and encourage and cater visitors to the province. The system will provide a basic network of sites along provincial waterways and highways to accommodate on a transient basis vacationing residents and visitors.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

At the present time we are currently preparing the most important and yet most difficult set of policies, those dealing with parks management, i.e. resources and people management within parks.

What I have said thusfar is intended to provide you with a broad policy basis in which the B.C. park system operates. There are other more specific policy areas which could be addressed, which I could address, but unfortunately time precludes that exercise here, and I shall be touching on some of them a little later on.

That constitutes the motherhood and apple pie portion of this presentation. I would now like to address the real world situation, and given the above, the foregoing, how is B.C. faring? Here are the statistics for those of you so inclined.

Today there exists in British Columbia some 372 provincial parks, recreation areas and nature conservancies encompassing some 4,500,000 hectares or 11,119,347 acres, or about 4.8 percent of the area of the province. Thirty-nine of these are larger than 5,000 hectares, and 300 are less than 500. It is also interesting to note that one of the parks contains 22 percent of the parkland base of the province, 12 contain about 85 percent of the total land base.

Wildland experiences may be found in about 70 different parks of the 372. For sailors and boaters there are 57 marine parks and 95 boat launch areas, 211 campgrounds containing in excess of 10,000 campsites that cater to the camping public. Parking for 24,000 vehicles are provided in 252 day use areas, and visitors may choose from 153 developed beach areas containing the sum of 58 kilometers of beach. That does not include the vast beaches of some of the coastal wildland parks.

The system contains some 2,000 kilometers of summer trails, and 300 kilometers of maintained winter trails, five downhill ski operations with a total lift capacity of about 10,000 people per hour. This past season we catered to about

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

16,000,000 visitors. We utilized improvements with a replacement value of approximately $300,000,000, and this was accomplished with a capital budget of $2.6 million in operations, an operations budget of just over $24,000,000, and 380 some odd permanent staff.

As I am sure you are aware, a park system of this magnitude can not be maintained or enlarged without a great deal of difficulty, especially in light of current economic situations, especially that in B.C. Some of the problems currently facing the parks in B.C. certainly are related to the economic situation, as is industry.

Some of the other problems, I will elaborate on that economic one as I go along, however it is probably true in Alberta and Ontario, the resource extraction industry looks upon parks as an uncapped reserve, they frequently cast coveted looks in our direction. They are loathe to see any further undesignated Crown land base withdrawn, or in their terms, tied up for park purposes. In some instances, I believe they have a valid case; in others I suspect their fears are imaginary.

Recently in B.C. the Ministry of Forests moved to expand the base of the provincial forest, the provincial forest designation considerably. Once designated as provincial forest, future park options would be severely curtailed, if not lost forever. However, a cooperative arrangement has been worked out whereby specific areas of interest to parks have been identified, and withheld from forest designation for approximately two years, during which period, park values will be determined and a proposal for park designation brought forward. This deferred area planning exercise has been reasonably successful, focusing attention on the real issues at hand, and has led to greater mutual understanding of the wants and desires of both agencies.

In an exercise somewhat similar to that which has just been completed in Ontario, at the request of our Minister we have just finished a -- I don't know what we call it -- I

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

suppose a future park system plan, I suppose it is a map of parks, bureaucrats, needs, wants and desires for the foreseeable future for chunks of land larger than a thousand hectares. Basically what we came up with is some 38 pieces of land consisting of something over a million hectares in total, which completes in all but two, completes the landscape representation in B.C., with the exception of two relatively minor representative landscapes.

We anticipate that going to Cabinet sometime this spring. I suppose again on a personal note, I'm not so sure that that is a good thing or a bad thing. If they are approved for future designation, I hope that is not the end of the B.C. park system, or at least the future additions to it. Although I think it can be seen from a political point of view in that way, there are certainly whole other areas and many other considerations to be taken into consideration in future designation of parks.

However, on the other hand, if a Minister can walk in and present such a thing to his colleagues and say there it is boys, that's what I'm asking for, when I get it I won't ask for any more, now you know, do the same for me in terms of gold and silver and some of the other metals, and in trees and roads and urban areas, it might settle some of the problems. The problem, I suppose, if you get down to it, is not an integrated type of planning as George mentioned, but a political one, and possibly is impossible to pull off.

Mineral exploration and extraction will probably be an ongoing challenge to parks, both before and after designation in B.C. Given changing technology, fluctuations in world mineral markets and demands, advance survey techniques, the vastness of the country involved, mineral exploration will never be a one-shot exercise. The question of mineral values versus park values is a question of which the final analysis will be answered by politicians. Again, there is a role for groups such as your own, an advisory role to assist the politicians in making that decision.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

In B.C., in the meantime, again cooperative arrangements have been made where we do allow some exploration in some parks on a controlled basis, and in some instances, are allowing mining to occur. While it may be heresy to some in some instances, a mining operation can be an interpretive asset in some parks. Granted, in others mining has no place.

In B.C., as in other jurisdictions, the matters of management of the national resources in parks rests with the Parks Branch, and this raises a number of problems. Generally speaking, attempts at resource management in provincial parks have been virtually non-existent, or token gestures at best. Fish, wildlife and forest management in parks, if it is carried out at all, it's usually a low priority accomplished with a minimum of resources which are contracted out to relevant resource management agencies to be conducted on a as time and money permits basis.

As a result of the recent reorganisation which I mentioned in B.C., for the first time B.C. parks will have a resident forester, a resident fish expert, fisheries expert, a wildlife technician and a geologist on staff to direct and advise on future resource management in parks. Hopefully their usefulness and importance will be recognised and their input continued.

In B.C. a number of government agencies provide recreation opportunities. As director of outdoor recreation, the outdoor recreation branch deals with 28 some odd different government agencies which are all actively involved in providing outdoor recreation opportunities or experiences. As you are probably aware, in B.C. the largest provider of outdoor recreation opportunities is the Ministry of Forests, who provides trails of all kinds, and what they refer to as rustic camping opportunities throughout the province.

Because of, I suppose, it is a matter of history, precedents, dear knows what, but in B.C. parks and forests

have always been in conflict. B.C. is not alone in that regard. The deferred planning area of planning exercise which I mentioned previously has alleviated some of the duplication, and in addition, we have entered into a protocol agreement basis with the Ministry of Forests, who will plan, develop, supply what facilities and what opportunities and where. That works amazingly well, especially at the staff level.

In addition, there is a group referred to as the Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Committee, which consists of the directors of approximately 12 agencies from the government who meet regularly on an informal basis to discuss mutual problems, review existing and proposed programs, and that too is a successful exercise.

In the area of new park establishment, we are preparing -- I am sorry, I mentioned that.

Through mechanisms such as protocol agreements, management agreements, we work fairly well with other agencies such as the Ecological Reserves Unit, the Land Division in our own Ministry, Fish and Wildlife and other groups within government. In dealing with outdoor recreation interest groups, we are fortunate in B.C. to have the Outdoor Recreation Council, of which many here I am sure are familiar. That Council, if requested by its member agencies, will carry forward to members of the government matters of concern to them. In addition, the senior executive of the Parks and Outdoor Recreation Division, the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife, Highways, usually including the Deputy Ministers and directors, meet on a regular basis with the executive of the Outdoor Recreation Council. That too has provided an excellent conduit running both ways between government and recreation interest groups.

In a recent move in our own division, our senior executive and the Assistant Deputy Minister and the key directors within the branch have established regular occurring meetings with the executive of key outdoor

recreation groups in the province, and I am confident that will lead eventually to some type of a parks and/or outdoor advisory council somewhat similar perhaps as to that which Dr. Priddle described in Ontario.

Probably the greatest challenge facing B.C. parks today is the matter of coping with reduced financial resources. As a result of restraint moves within the B.C. government, the overall staffing of parks will be reduced by approximately 40 percent. In terms of permanent staff, this means 388 bodies will be reduced to something like 190. 390 some odd what is referred to as a buss word in B.C., George, that you can take back with you, full time equivalents will be reduced to approximately 200. At the same time, there is a political commitment to maintain the existing park system staffing levels, there is a commitment to maintaining the existing system at current levels, and staffing levels in parks will remain essentially unchanged with reductions occurring in planning, design, engineering and administration staff virtually at all levels. In some instances, operations will be contracted or leased to the private sector, and this had happened already with some of the downhill areas, downhill ski areas, I'm sure again you may have heard that Manning Park and Cypress have been leased out on contract, as has one of our lodge operations. We are already heavily into contracting out park maintenance, in two instances in the past year we had to put park operations out on a concession basis with a high degree of success.

One concern was that park visitors would be concerned that park staff were not in the parks. As it turns out the park visitors were not aware that park staff were not operating the parks.

We will be placing greater emphasis on volunteer programs, and this past year we instituted a voluntary host program which went a long way to ease the load on our existing park staff, and we anticipate expanding that program in future years. We have entered into arrangements

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Moffat)

with cooperating associations in at least two parks. Capital development will be held to a minimum, and maintenance of existing plants will have to be accomplished with dollars impacted by inflation.

As you probably gathered from my earlier comments, there are problems with the B.C. Park Act, and there have been a number of requests go forward over the last couple of years from both within the organization and from outside to open up the Act and adjust it. The B.C. Government at the present time is currently very much loathe to do so, feeling that the Act is fairly strong and that we can work within the policy. As a result we are moving towards things like the recreation corridors policy, again some of you may have heard of that, which will be a government policy recognizing recreation corridors for what they are, and demanding or instructing cooperative arrangements between the government agencies and utilizing existing legislation to designate recreation corridors; both trails, waterways and shorelines.

There are other problems and issues facing B.C. parks, and other parks in general, such as the impact of the travelling non-resident public, the accurate determination of demand for recreation opportunities, hydro and other resources development, the security of parklands on a rapidly eroding land base. and the list goes on and on and on. I am sure as time goes by, solutions will be found, formally or informally, probably due in a great deal to groups such as the Advisory Council and others, and hopefully we can all keep working together and communicating our problems and our solutions.

I trust my comments have provided some insight into the situation in B.C., and will provide a basis for your discussions over the next couple of days. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Thank you very much Denis, might we now turn to Donn Cline of Alberta Recreation and Parks to give us a perspective on our own province here of Alberta.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Cline)

MR. CLINE: Thank you very much, Guy, it is a pleasure to be here with a group of people who have a very common interest with our department's objective, and also to see again some old familiar faces. Both my panel members I have had good association with in the past, and as George Priddle mentioned, the last time he saw me was beside a swimming pool in Bali; the last time I saw Denis Moffat was in February at Portage and Main in Winnipeg, and in between is a whole world.

I was interested to hear so many opening remarks and kind of references to religion and so on, because you know that the three essential ingredients to a good story, any story of any length is, what, it's religion, royalty and sex, that's why the best short story in the world is,"'My God', cried the Duchess, 'get your hand off my knee'!"

I guess one of the things that Alberta is into these days more than anything else is something Denis referred to and that is privatization, and one of the small benefits to being a civil servant in a world where we want to get more and more involved in the private sector is that occasionally a consultant takes you out to lunch. And today was one of those days for me, and additionally they gave me a small gift. Now usually in the past I suppose a couple of hundred dollars under the table would have been a small gift, but in these economic times what I got was a little book called "1984", and it has got a place to write all your expense account records. But if anybody wants one, it's Associated Engineering Services Limited, and they said last year they had several hundred left over, this is 1984, so I don't know what they did with the old stock.

One of the interesting things it has is up in the corner there is a thought for the week, and there is a few that kind of struck home here because they relate to this group and some of the people here. The first one is by Helen Castle and it says, "If Noah had been truly wise, he would have swatted those two flies."

There is a whole sort of equalizing environmental consideration there. The next one relates to perhaps best to Ontario, and it says, "Progress might have been all right once, but it has gone on too long." And the next one, of course, is all about provincial parks, it says, "Spring being a tough act to follow, God created June."

And finally, I think the last one, which is for George Priddle I'm sure, it says, "Idealism increases in direct proportion to one's distance from the problem." We were very idealistic in Bali, and I am quite pragmatic these days.

Before I launch into the pre-recorded portion, two things I would like to do; one is I would like to introduce you to a member of my staff who is going to spend the balance of the conference with you, one of the high costs of being involved in directing an organization is you can't seem to stay long enough, I am here today and gone tomorrow. But I have here tonight, and he is going to be around the rest of the weekend, my chief guru, and a man who has perhaps a better knowledge and detail than anyone else of the principles on which we are working, and the direction in which we are going over the next little while. It gives me a great deal of pleasure if I could introduce Dave Pearson, he's in the middle at the back, would you stand up for a minute? He is the guy, he has two functions here, he is going to answer any questions if it has a number larger than three, and to be your resource and a participant with you over the coming little while.

Was that all I said he was going to do -- I think so. Okay, let me hit you with the good stuff here, just the way it is, and it's something that I think you can all relate to very easily, and that is your home country. When I was a little boy about 30 years ago I moved to Manitoba and my boss was the Director of Parks at the time, not this Director of Parks over here, he was the guy that came after me. But my boss, when he was Director of Parks, the first question I asked him is, "How can you really live with yourself being a

Director of Parks in this country that is all flat and wet and not very interesting at all -- why don't you aspire to move someplace else like B.C. where everything is grandiose and wonderful?" I was already angling for his job. And the thing that he said to me I guess kind of I didn't expect it, and it has lived with me ever since as a sort of a salute to being where you are. He said, "My son," and he didn't know me very well, he said, "My son, any idiot can be a Director of Parks in B.C., but here in Manitoba you really have to be smart." I suppose in Alberta we are somewhere in between.

The Department of Recreation and Parks is at a pivotal point with respect to provisions, planning and operations of parks and recreation areas. We are currently taking stock of our past and charging our future, that is we are attempting to define our appropriate niche with respect to the provincial ultimate recreation and ultimate space system. I am sure that the decisions and directions that we embark upon over the next five years related to parks and recreation areas will have far-reaching benefits for the future of this province for many years to come.

Before outlining some of our new programs and policy initiatives, I believe it is useful to briefly capsule past events. The evolution of our provincial parks system can be categorized into two distinct phases, and I think we are just about starting into Phase 3. Briefly the first phase, and you will forgive me if I go back to the Bible, perhaps is best labelled Genesis, spans from the inception of the provincial parks in Alberta in 1932, till the end of the 1960's. This period was primarily one of providing small local parks. Little emphasis was placed on establishing a system of parks to protect or represent significant natural resources. Heritage protection, economic stimulation and destination recreation were generally left to the national parks, and in particular to Banff.

In the early 1970's, a notable shift in direction emerged, an assessment of a provincial park system identified

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Cline)

several problem areas, and a position paper released in 1973 set forth several principles to remedy these problems, including the following four needs:

1. For an increased financial commitment.

2. For parks to be more accessible to the people of Alberta.

3. For more larger resource based parks.

4. For integrated planning of Alberta's heritage and recreational resources.

Tremendous strides in those four areas were made throughout the 1970's. The increased financial commitment was immediately forthcoming, and continued throughout that decade. This increased commitment resulted in a dramatic expansion of our park system through land acquistion programs, upgrading and new development programs of existing parks, and development of several new areas.

An urban parks program was implemented to provide urban residents with easier access to natural areas. This program led to the establishment of Fish Creek Provincial Park in Calgary, and Strathcona Science Park in Edmonton. It also led our department to assisting in the planning and development of the City of Edmonton operative Capital City Recreation Park through provincial grants. The urban parks program was extended to the cities of Grande Prairie, Red Deer, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat and Lloydminster in 1980, and the construction of many of the facilities in these centres which is presently underway.

In 1972, few large parks existed, and over one half of the parks were less than 200 hectares in size, and Denis can tell you what the translation of that is into acres. The position paper outlined a new policy for park establishment in that the parks should be larger and more nature-oriented. There was a need to have representation of all natural regions in the park system, and increased emphasis given to programs to encourage understanding and appreciation of our natural heritage. The parks established throughout the 1970's

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Cline)

generally followed this new direction and resulted in the amount of land designated to provincial parks more than doubling during the ten-year period between 1972 and 1982.

Improved representation of the natural regions in the province occurred, especially in regard to the mixed wood boreal forest through additions such as Lake Miquelon, Crystal Lake and Lesser Slave Lake Provincial Parks; and the Rocky Mountain natural region through the establishment of the Kananaskis Provincial Park.

Significant voids still exist, however, especially in the grassland and parkland natural regions.

Significant strides have been made with respect to integrated planning, but much more remains to be done. Significant events in this regard were the initiation of the Integrated Management Planning Program under the auspices of Energy and Natural Resources. I should have said, by the way, we do have one of our people here, Cliff Lacey, who is with the Urban Parks Program, and would be happy, I'm sure, during the course of your time here to share some experiences with him. We also have from the Alberta Forest Service, Barry Rogers who is with the Recreation Program. We do have some other experts here who have got all kinds of things in their heads.

In addition to the Integrated Management Planning Program of Energy and Natural Resources, there is the Lake Management Program of Municipal Affairs, as well as the development of Kananaskis Recreation Country, which was the first blueprint for implementing the Eastern Slopes policy at the operational level, and the recently announced Blackfoot Grazing Reserve, which is situated immediately east of Edmonton.

The 1970's were a period of unprecedented growth in all aspects of life in our province. The introduction of new recreation technology and increasing resource pressures being exerted on the park system, as well as the strain of the new directions upon which the department was embarking, we

experienced numerous adolescent growing pains. Fortunately we were blessed with an increasing human resource and capital budget, and we scrambled to meet the public's needs and expanding appetite for outdoor recreation. As might be expected, as our energies were spent in this struggle to satisfy immediate needs, some areas tended to be neglected, in particular organizational issues and policy formulation and regulation.

The boom times of the '70's are now over. Today we are faced with the stark realities of today's depressed economy, a smaller civil service and reduced revenues to direct into capital projects are the order of the day. On the other hand, recreation pressures generated during the past decade are still with us to a large degree. Many of the growing pains experienced throughout the second phase still require resolution. These and other issues are what I would like to address now as I see it on the verge of entering into a new phase, which following my earlier analogies, can best be described as the maturing years.

One benefit accruing to our department from today's less buoyant economy, is that it allows us to catch our breath, to redirect our efforts, priorities and resources under less hectic conditions. One of the initial steps in this regard is the undertaking of an issues management study, with the express purpose of identifying concerns and emerging key issues confronting the department. This task, although it is not yet complete, has identified several strategic issues which must receive our immediate attention.

Two of these issues are; firstly that at the present time there is no government approved or explicitly stated philosophical base for the department to deliver its service. Neither has the department established or adopted clear and concise coordinated and measurable objectives. To these ends we will embark upon the preparation of a corporate plan that will set out a well-articulated set of objectives that provide consistent directions throughout all of the

department's programs and services.

Secondly, there is evidence of substantial overlap and duplication in the delivery of the programs and services within the parks and recreation field of the province. Although the function and purpose of the departments may be distinct at the mandate and legislative levels, often there is overlap in the policy and program levels. Potential problems arising from this situation include confusion between departments regarding responsibilities, delivery of similar services to similar clients, confusion on the part of the public in terms of who is responsible for what services, and varying design, construction and operating standards. Anytime I am at a cocktail party and somebody lights into me about the deplorable condition of one of our back country campsites, I quickly point out it belongs to Alberta Forest Service.

Resolving these issues must be viewed as a long term objective. Some efforts towards resolving the issues are, however, already underway. Continued participation with other agencies in coordinating programs is a prerequisite. Some of these other agencies that are involved in providing land base conservation programs are the Alberta Forest Service, Alberta Fish and Wildlife Services, Alberta Environment, Municipal Affairs, Transportation, Public Lands Division of Energy and Natural Resources, and the Historic Sites Division of Alberta Culture.

The preparation of our corporate plan and the framework and guidelines, which I will outline in a minute, will clearly articulate the direction the department is taking, as they will be the two principle tools for guiding the system of conservation and recreation programs the department offers.

Also through a variety of measures, including the Development of program policies, the adoption of architectural design standards and the upgrading of facilities in many more areas, we hope to ensure consistency in what the public can expect in our programs.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Cline)

Earlier I mentioned the framework and guidelines policy paper, this paper outlines the interrelationship between the four land base program elements administered by the department, namely, wilderness areas, ecological reserves, provincial parks and recreation areas. The policy paper was prepared to provide a framework to facilitate program planning and development, to reduce the confusion with respect to the direction of our programs, and to enhance public understanding of our many programs and activities.

The framework is designed to outline the continuum of recreation opportunities and natural resources conservation policies and programs. The framework responds to the public's diverse needs by recognizing that people vary enormously in what they desire from their recreational pursuits, and that quality in outdoor recreation is best assured through the provision of a diverse set of opportunities, both in facilities and in heritage appreciation conservation areas.

This need to provide a broad range of outdoor recreation opportunities and conservation programs is the underlying premise of the new framework. The purpose of wilderness areas is to preserve provincially significant areas in their wild and primitive state, while allowing for selective wilderness recreation activities. These areas afford the visitor opportunities for isolation, challenge and solitude in a natural undisturbed setting. Visitors may travel on foot only, and no facility development is permitted.

The purpose of ecological reserves -- maybe I should try the numbers things, I said I wouldn't go over three -- wilderness areas, how many are there? Three, thank you, see, I was dangerously close. The purpose of ecological reserves is to retain examples of the full range of Alberta's natural environmental diversity for the purposes of preservation and scientific research. Only a very narrow range of recreational opportunities will be permitted, and these will be directly related to environmental education and heritage

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Cline)

appreciation opportunities. I want to very clearly point out that the number of established ecological reserves in the Province of Alberta is zero, it's a number I am quite comfortable with, I can keep it in my head. We only recently had amendments to the Act, to bring ecological reserves, and there is an Ecological Reserves Advisory Committee that has been established to advise the Minister on the appropriate ecological reserves to establish, and they are just now getting geared up to talk to the public.

The intent of the parks is to maintain provincially significant natural heritage resources, to contribute to the public's understanding and appreciation of and respect for our cultural and natural heritage, and to provide for compatible amenities and recreational opportunities.

The recreation areas category is the most diverse. The basic premise of the recreation category is to provide a broad range of recreation sites and opportunities. These will range from simple low key highway stopovers, such as many of the sites that were recently transferred to us from Alberta Transportation. To moderately develop recreation facilities and opportunities in natural settings such as we have in many of our existing small to medium size provincial parks like Saskatoon Island or Redwater, Pembina River or Willow Creek, to highly developed recreational facilities in natural or largely manmade settings parallel to the developments in Fish Creek, Strathcona Science or Aspen Beach. The primary emphasis will be on the provision of a diverse range of outdoor recreation sites, opportunities and facilities. Although this does not imply we will neglect our resource stewardship role in these areas. It is felt that this program element will provide us with the increased flexibility needed to better respond to the diverse needs of our citizens by providing us with an opportunity to increase our range of program opportunities.

Whereas the emphasis of the previous decade was on meeting growth, efficiency and cost effectiveness are now of

the utmost priority. We have rejected the mandate approach for financial management, and placed the challenge on evaluating, efficiency and effectiveness of our programs and services. This has been achieved through a variety of measures including cost studies, altering our budgeting process, improved accountability and expenditure control, setting specific priorities and objectives for ourselves.

Operational costs have been reduced through a variety of means such as the introduction of self-registration programs at campsites, the preparation of service contracts for cleaning park buildings and maintaining kept service grounds, and the adoption of new manpower fish and garbage collection systems. The word privatization has become a part of our everyday vocabulary. Rather than being distraught at the turn of events, we are meeting the challenge with innovative and imaginative thinking.

In closing there is one other area that I would like to touch upon, perhaps an area that we overlook or take for granted, or don't even consider as being something that is related to our problem in the provincial parks and recreation areas management, and that is the influence of the national parks. So I would like to take a minute to examine the way that Alberta's national parks have impacted upon the parks and recreation programs of the province.

The national parks have had a definite and strong influence on the establishment of outdoor recreation and conservation programs at the provincial level. With the five national parks, that is Banff, Jasper, Waterton, Elk Island and a good portion of Wood Buffalo occupying about 8 percent of the provincial land base, a percentage which is far in excess of that in any other province, the national parks have been a major deterrent to the growth of the provincial park system for heritage resource conservation. In the past we have relied heavily upon the national parks for natural heritage protection. Only in the early 1970's, with increased public emphasis on what we call lately discovering our roots,

we see significant strides made in establishing and managing parks at the provincial level for conservation purposes. The heritage resources of the province cover a spectrum far broader than that which is represented in the national parks. As our citizens' appreciation of the diversity of the other conservation values of our province mature, it is expected that the significance of the national parks in this role will wane somewhat.

However, although we have made great strides in our conservation programs in recent years, hesitations concerning major expansion of these programs will always exist due to the total amount of resources already committed to the national parks of the province. The presence of national parks explains to a large extent why in the early years the vast majority of our parks were small locally oriented playgrounds. In the past we relied heavily on the national parks in meeting the recreation needs of our citizens as well. This reliance has diminished considerably during the past three decades as the various provincial agencies significantly expand their programs.

Nevertheless, the national parks will always play a significant role in the province's recreation tourism objectives.

Finally, I thank you again for inviting me here tonight, and trust that you will have a successful three days, thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Thank you very much, Donn. As I indicated at the commencement of this evening's proceedings, I intended to let our three panelists respond if they so wished to the other speakers. I will now give them that opportunity before opening up for general discussion and questioning. Do either three of you want to comment on what has been said? They obviously decline, so we will open the floor for questions, but before I do take questions, could I remind you once again if you could indicate who you would

like the question addressed to, if it is specific, and in so doing also indicate your name and which particular study group you represent, and also could I remind you to use the microphones, there are a number available.

DR. HACKLER: I am Jim Hackler from the Science Advisory Committee, I don't like to be the first person to introduce a critical note, but this committee would not be doing their job if it were not critical now and then. Let me just ask the question of Mr. Cline, and it is specifically regarding the development of campsites in parks. Here in Banff there are a number of parksites where you go through a road which is two strips of gravel and you go into a campsite which has trees around it, and violence has been done to the surroundings. Several years ago when I went to the Kananaskis for the first time, you go up this nice asphalt road into the campsite, which was like a parking lot for city buses with gravel tamped down, a fire pit about four feet down, and if you put in a half a cord of wood you might see the flame after a while. It was clear that the person who designed that park hated trees, hated people to use tents and hated fireplaces. The question I have then is, is this the sort of mentality that we are going to continue to have for the development of campsites, is there any gentler way to proceed?

MR. CLINE: First of all, I would need to know which campground you were in, perhaps you don't remember the name. To my personal knowledge your description only fits one that I know of, and that is a campsite that was developed to rehabilitate a gravel pit, and in fact did look like that.

DR. HACKLER: There were trees around it, but not where the parking lot had been made.

MR. CLINE: I would venture, I guess, only to say first of all that your description doesn't fit the general development of campsites in the province, I would hope that what you have picked out is a significant variation from the

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON
(Question Period)

standard. I think that the campsite developments that goes on in national parks and provincial parks from a design point of view is essentially the same. I feel fairly comfortable in saying that in having worked seven years in the national parks and 14 or so years doing the same in provincial settings, and that there is very little difference in the standards. There may be some specific examples, I don't think the general is much different at all.

MR. MERRICK: My name is Gordon Merrick, I am with the Pollution Study Group, and I am directing my question to Mr. Moffat from B.C. My question concerns a lot of advertising for Moresby Park, the people in B.C., a lot of people want to make it into a park and they are sending their brochures across Canada; what is your feeling about whether there should be a park when outside people, like groups from other areas asking for this?

MR. MOFFAT: I believe you are making reference to South Moresby Island?

MR. MERRICK: Right.

MR. MOFFAT: Are you familiar with South Moresby Island, it is a major island lying in the Charlotte group, the Queen Charlotte Islands, probably has international significance from any number of points of view in terms of the flora, the fauna, especially the sea life, sea mammals, recreation opportunities, if you don't mind getting rained on since it gets something like 600 centimeters of rain every year, which is ridiculous, are virtually unlimited. It's a representative landscape, both nationally and provincially, and also has lots of fiber.

There has been a government instituted study team working on a plan for five years. The study team is made up of private citizens, interest groups, government agencies and industry, and no wonder it has taken five years. They are about to present a series of options to government. They are going to recommend, I believe it is four options to government, which run the gamut basically from total preservation at one

end to total resource utilization at the other. Along with the options, they have outlined the relative impacts of each of the options from a number of points of view. So basically what they are doing is there has been, I suppose, a study that they are presenting to government saying if you do this here is the implications, if you do this here are the implications. Now this process has been carried out over five years with a number of people becoming aware of it, and it generated a fair amount of interest across the country. Groups such as the Wildlife League, all kinds of people, are interested in what happens on South Moresby Island. Should groups become involved, should they be campaigning across the country, I'm not sure I should or could comment on that, other than it's a matter of personal conflict. Certainly in the Valhalla situation I suspect that the public input came from across the country and it came from an international basis and it probably influenced a final decision with regard to Valhalla. That's all I can say.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Another question from the right, and then go to the left one.

MS. HEDENSTROM: I'm Joanne Hedenstrom from the Pollution Study Group, and I would like to address a question to Mr. Cline. While I appreciate what you had to say in the sense of outlining the three phases of plans that Alberta has for the future park policy, I was concerned that I never once heard you mention public input, or a public input system, or a public advisory system. Now, Mr. Priddle may feel frustration in Ontario when his Deputy Minister had no sympathy with the public input process, however, he was at least able to work within a system of public input, and I think we have some disastrous provincial parks in Alberta, and I think they might not have happened if we had had more public input, and I'd like to know why we haven't had that ongoing give and take between the public and the parks in Alberta?

MR. CLINE: Thank you very much for that question

because it is one that I guess is a real sort of tough thing that we are struggling with, and it is getting right down to the real balance between public input and the desires of the politicians not to be too -- no, I'm not saying this one right at all, let me back up for a minute.

I have got to start all over because it isn't the politicians, it's I guess the bureaucrats you run up against who say I know what's right and I'm going to do it. We have had a variety of kinds of public input, we do have advisory committees on a number of existing parks, and as I was mentioning, we have the advisory committee on wilderness areas which is just getting started; it's a joint bureaucratic and public members board, six from the public and six from the various parts of bureaucracy. But we don't have a broad provincial policy on public input. I mentioned that we have issued management studies that had just been wrapped up by a consulting firm for us, and they have delivered to us a lot of the issues without any solutions. One of the issues was what are you going to do about having a comprehensive process of public involvement? We don't have it at the moment, I agree with you, and we should have, I agree with both those points. So I have to leave it there, I guess.

MR. WALLIS: Cliff Wallis, my question is an extension of the last two, and I think it is addressed to all of you, we have people within government without here and that is whether governments respond more to confrontation by the public, or whether they respond more in an integrated planning system; in other words, what is the best approach for the public, or is it a combination of both, first you hit them over the head and then you hit them with some sort of compromise. Perhaps somewhere in there you have some sort of background on that?

MR. MOFFAT: If I may, I am going to give a non-answer based on two recent experiences in B.C. which you may be familiar with. One is the establishment of Valhalla Provincial Park in which there certainly was a concerted

public participation, integrated management resource planning exercise, and I will show my bias and say that the park people won in the Valhalla instance. The most recent one is the Meares Island situation off the west coast of Vancouver Island. A very similar kind of process, and the parks people lost that. It was two political decisions, black and white, the same process, I don't know what the answer is.

DR. PRIDDLE: I think the thing, on public participation an citizens advisory is when to be cooperative and when to be confrontational, it all depends on the situation, you have to change with the players. I remember when I was first getting into this business in Washington and I was talking to the man who was the executive officer for the Historical Sites Advisory Council to the President, and this had been established by President Kennedy. He said when it was under President Kennedy they had excellent discussions, Kennedy rounded up the best minds in the country for this advisory body. They accomplished nothing, but they had great discussions. Then President Johnson got a bunch of businessmen on the thing as well as a brain trust, and they got a lot of things done. Then Nixon owed a lot of people favors and just ran around the country and drank up at public expense. So in my own experience I found that we worked in an integrated way with the public advisory councils as long as the Minister saw that as a positive thing. Where we got into a confrontation situation is where we literally didn't have a Minister in place, or a man was just coming in and the Deputy Minister was running it and it fell apart. Then we almost had to be a phoenix and throw ourselves on the fire because the situation was getting so ludicrous that if we didn't blow the whistle we would have lost credibility. I don't think these things necessarily go on forever, they go up and down and change form depending a little bit on the moment.

MR. CLINE: Cliff, I will just close with a kind

of personal feeling about it, it is not based on much logic, more based on emotion, and that is one or the other but don't try to be both. It's awfully difficult to have somebody beating me over the head for several months, and then sit around the table and say why don't we get together on this thing. Get together, like hell, if you want to beat me on the head, beat me on the head the next day too, and we know where we stand.

MR. FINLAY: Cam Finlay, Urban Study Group. I would like to address Mr. Moffat from B.C. in two different questions, and we'll take them one at a time. I'd like you to explain, sir, the rationale on how renewable and non-renewable resources extraction fit in the mandate of B.C. provincial parks, there seems to be some controversy and you sort of alluded to it just a minute ago?

MR. MOFFAT: I guess the question is how do we justify extraction of resources in provincial parks?

MR. FINLAY: Right, basically the non-renewable.

MR. MOFFAT: First off you will recall I say in terms of existing classifications in parks and the Parks Act, there is a Class A park, which to all intents and purposes the only reason any kind of resources would be extracted or harvested or manipulated is for the protection of the development of the park. That is how you build a road, or chop down a tree for a campground. Class B parks have fallen into disuse in recreation areas from a couple of points of view. In some instances we feel that a recreational activity and resource harvesting can continue side by side. We have, well one instance pops to mind is the Silver Star Recreation Area being managed for fiber production, there are trees coming out of Silver Star Recreation Area. It is also a first class ski hill and the skiiers and foresters get along very well. The foresters do their thing in the summertime and the skiiers go in in the wintertime.

In a couple of other instances we have allowed mineral extraction in parks, that is getting into the shady areas.

Unfortunately on that one where we are sort of a little bit stuck right now is there has been, well, we are awaiting decisions from the Supreme Court of Canada. The Provincial Supreme Court determined that the mineral lease had existed, or existed before the creation of the park, and the park had to honor the mineral leases or buy out the interests. It is very interesting for someone sitting there with a lease to try and negotiate a price for what is underneath a square footage of ground. In a couple of other instances they have been in fairly remote parts of the park, and frankly the miner and we are the only ones that know they are there, and we do control it.

The other thing I said, and I think I may have plucked a nerve, I do believe in some instances a working mine can be an interpretive advantage or plus in a provincial park. Why not tell the people about mining, it's a story, why not? Some people say well let's let the miners do it themselves. Well it gets down to the push and pull, rock and a hard place, okay if someone says we've got to have a mine in that park, you can always come back with the condition that yes, provided they tell the story. Our tenure in Manitoba, we did open a mine in a park, but one of the conditions was that the company had to tell the story, and it was interesting how that changed their act.

MR. FINLAY: Thank you, and another question is something that is at the heart of a lot of things that is involved in parks and that is volunteerism, you and I, and I support what you're saying, by the way in arranging volunteers, but many questions come to mind such as how are you going to recruit them, how are you going to train them, their reliability, where are you going to get them, who is going to supervise them? As you know, volunteers give something which is most precious to them, and that is their time, and you have got to do a lot for them too. Have you looked into all those kinds of factors?

MR. MOFFAT: Not all of them, no, I think we have

brushed a few of them. Where do we find them, admittedly a difficult problem. Our Outdoor Recreation Council has been our, I suppose, key recruitment agency in spreading the word of the need. Newspaper advertising, key contact people in various groups throughout the province. We do run a volunteer training program for volunteers working in our parks naturalist and interpretation programs, and every spring if we can, the volunteers are given the same training course as our park naturalists are in a condensed version. Rather than a week, it may be a weekend. We have a thing called a volunteer program assistance grant, we will pay out-of-pocket expenses to volunteers. We will help them out with meals, gas, and in some instances lodging. If they need equipment to do something, we will attempt to do our utmost to get that for them, let them buy it, lease it, or let them use the park equipment. We insure our volunteers, they are covered under Workers' Compensation with a policy that we have through the Provincial Secretary and the Ministry in B.C.

I suppose it is a philosophical thing to try to let them think, or make them think, or assist them to think, or persuade them that the park is theirs, and, you know, possession is nine-tenths of whatever, that works very well. We are working on a number of fronts, or brushing on a number of fronts, as I think the points you made, your first one, it is finding the volunteers is our biggest problem.

MR. FINLAY: There is the supervision factor too.

MR. MOFFAT: Yes, there is, we recognize that as a problem. We have volunteers supervising volunteers. We figure that while we are not replacing our staff with volunteers, that runs counter to our union agreement, if we can have a hierarchy of supervision working with that staff, certainly there can be one working outside of staff. We ran a very successful program under the need and the employment assistance program, it's a make work program that ran this year, a lot of those are supervised by volunteers in parks.

MR. PRIDDLE: My name is Tom Priddle, no relation

to the person sitting down there, and I am with the Urban Study Group. I would like Mr. Cline to answer a question, or make a suggestion to Mr. Cline. It seems to me a lot of these people out here are cynical of bureaucrats and politicians and you can tell we are cynical because we were all sitting here watching you drink that water because they saw the sign and you didn't. They are just dying to see you throw up that water in a minute. It seems to me that one of the smallest minorities in this province is the politician, most people stay as far away from being a politician as they can, so that is a very small minority, and yet most of the bodies, councils, advisory groups, provincial planning boards, these things are appointed by politicians who end up being by political appointment of one sort or another. The only one I have discovered up to now that isn't politically persuaded is this group. Why is it that some of the other ministries, for example, you wanted to find out what the public think about a certain park, or whether a certain park be developed, somebody sets a little group, why wouldn't your department or the Housing Department, or the Municipal Affairs Department use this group to set up public hearings? If you see the one they are doing on land hearings right now, they are getting a heck of a lot more input than what the Provincial Planning Board goes out to a hearing, or when your group goes out to a hearing. Why can't the other ministries use this group to get to the public? Because they can do it better than you can is what I am saying.

MR. CLINE: In response, and I appreciate that you put it out as a suggestion, but in response I think that there has been a recognition that that is not a bad idea, I have heard it considered from a number of people lately that perhaps that's not a bad way to go. So that in fact that may happen. I can't tell you why it hasn't happened in the past.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Before I take any more questions, I know there are two questions waiting, so I think I will take those two and bring it to a close at that point, and if

people want to discuss informally with our speakers subsequently in the evening they can do it at that particular point in time.

MR. PASCHEN: Gerry Paschen with the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. While our theme is to do with provincial prospectives, we heard what happened in British Columbia financially with staff layoffs, et cetera, proposed layoffs, and Mr. Moffat indicated this quite well today to Mr. Finlay when he said the parks are ours. What bothers me very much is when I do come to the parks, I have to pay, and I was wondering in these economic times we have we would like to see the park, and know it's ours, why do we have to pay when we come here? I would like to have a response from all three of them. Thank you.

DR. PRIDDLE: That was an interesting thing I had to face on the Parks Council, was one year we were saying should people pay to get into the park, and if so, how much, and could we come up with a formula for that. And so it was a tough one really that we had a lot of difficulty with. One time I know the national parks were considering cutting out the actual fee for entry into I think a lot of the national parks. What the basic philosophical conclusion came to was that the parks in Ontario belong to the people of that province, therefore they are paying for them in terms of the acquisition costs and development costs of them. But not all of the people of the Province of Ontario use them. They are all paying for them in terms of acquisition and development, but should they all bear the equal burden of operation and maintenance, and the conclusion was no, they should not. Then the next question was well, then should we collect all the money at the gate that is required to pay for the operation and maintenance of the parks, and that was felt somewhat unrealistic other than to collect the amount of money that would be necessary to operate and maintain and develop facilities.

In other words, campgrounds, campsites, and beaches that

were guarded, and on that basis it literally worked out to we should be collecting, and that cost was about 60 percent of the total operations and maintenance of the system, and so that was the basis on which we said philosophically we should be collecting about 60 percent of operation and maintenance for the system. And that turned out to be just about what they were collecting, so that was the kind of rationale for it; nobody had ever thought it through before.

Now, there are exceptions on top of that, there was a question of should people who are underprivileged or unemployed or whatever, should they be given special consideration. That happens to the extent that we have what we call group campgrounds for Boy Scouts, for Y.M.C.A. groups and so on, and they are not charged. Senior citizens get in free if they are residents of Ontario.

And the second question was should there be a differential for people in Ontario and from people outside that jurisdiction. That one was batted around a lot and we finally decided no, that probably should not happen because then you just get a reciprocal kind of thing.

Thank you.

MR. CLINE: I would like to be specific about what is happening in Alberta. First of all at the present time there is no charge for entry into provincial parks. The thing that we charge for is camping where you have specific use of a specific site, and I guess it would be easy just to walk away from it there, but the fact is that our department is considering a number of ways to increase revenues to offset operating costs. And therefore making the general burden on the taxpayer harder, and we were very seriously asking ourselves the question, should we in fact charge fees to attempt to recover some targeted percentage of our costs? So that the time may be coming when in fact Alberta will undertake to charge fees for park entry and other kinds of activities on something of a cost recovery basis. And I think that is a reflection of the same kind of thing that you see

in hospital user fees and doctors charging extra billing and everything else. If you really value it, then you should be prepared to pay something for it, and I don't know as there is a great deal of correlation between the value and the fact that it is free. You may in fact appreciate it more if it costs you a little.

I have a personal feeling that you shouldn't have to go as far as some places have gone to the point where in fact it becomes a serious deterrent to some people enjoying their own natural resources. I would also feel that it could go a little further than it does.

DR. GRIFFITHS: I have a question of Donn Cline, I am Graham Griffiths of the Pollution Study Group, and in your talk, Mr. Cline, you mentioned the fact of the Blackfoot Grazing Reserves, I am not sure what the correct title is now, I understand that a new plan has been prepared for this reserve, now it seems when you have cows in parks you have endless trouble, in fact it has been a thorn of contention for some time, and now you have the Blackfoot of which another bureaucratic entity, namely the Grazing Reserves Division wash their hands. Now, one of the problems with the Blackfoot has been that public input was not sought at an early enough stage and in a meaningful form. Several meetings were held, information meetings basically officials went out there, attempted to defend their plans as best they could. Various people criticized the plans, and the officials went away and duly ignored the criticism. Briefs were solicited from the public, and many briefs were sent in. I believe you now have a mailing list of 600 people, and probably many of these sent in briefs. However, since the briefs were not received in the public hearing forum, nobody knows what any of the briefs said, and the officials would say, oh but of course they support our plans, and you would inquire of other people who sent in briefs and you would discovery nobody was supporting the plans, so there is a credibility gap in the planning because a public hearing

was not held.

Now my leading question here is what are your plans for ongoing public input into planning for the Blackfoot, will you consider holding a proper public hearing if there is sufficient demand for this?

MR. CLINE: The most direct response is that the matter is not in my hands because the Honorable Don Sparrow who is the Minister of whatever his title is, Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife, made a statement in the House that if there is sufficient interest that he would take the plans for the Blackfoot back to the public. I can't say whether that is proper or improper, I'm not sure what your definition is. But there was a commitment on the part of that Minister to go back and talk to the public on an informational basis to tell them what is going to happen. In terms of, however, going back to the planning stages, if that is what you are suggesting, the likelihood is that there is not enough time. The finalization, based on the integrated management plan was done, the finalization of the design and working drawings for construction are a matter of process right now, and it is expected that the construction will begin next spring. So I anticipate that there is not enough time for you to have another go around with public involvement in that plan.

CHAIRMAN SWINNERTON: Thank you, it just remains therefore for me to thank our three speakers this evening very much on your behalf for what I think has been a most interesting session. It has given us an interesting overview of some of the issues, some of the problems, some of the approaches for dealing with those problems, particularly here in Alberta. I would like you to join with me now in thanking the three panelists for presenting this evening.

(APPLAUSE)

(MEETING ADJOURNED UNTIL FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9TH, 1983)

MORNING SESSION - 8:30 A.M.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to bring this meeting to order, and first I will make one announcement that concerns some of us here. I would like to bring your attention to the "No Smoking" signs in this building, and it has been a request that there be no smoking in this auditorium.

I was very gratified to see so many of you out so early in the morning, the program plan for the next two days deals with various issues, very timely and important. I hope that the meeting will be educational and informative, and that information gained would be used as resource material by the members of the various study groups. I feel that the Public Advisory Committee has had a successful year, and as it has been indicated by the resolutions that are well presented in your documents, we are all concerned with protecting our environment, and I hope our deliberations over the next two days will translate into a more effective program to the preservation of the environment.

Ladies and gentlemen, I welcome you to the Thirteenth Annual Joint Meeting of the Public Advisory Committees and the Environment Council of Alberta. With this I declare the meeting officially opened, and I would like to call now on Mr. Jim Vollmershausen, Superintendent Banff for a few words of welcome. Jim?

MR. VOLLMERSHAUSEN: Thank you, you got more than the Jim out without any trouble at all. Thank you very much, my job at the moment is to welcome you to Banff, and that is certainly a pleasure for me to do that. It could only be an appropriate place for a meeting of this sort. We, after all, have some of our objectives exactly the same.

I have been doing a bit of reading about the role of the Advisory Committees and the Council, and find that it is something that I should probably be -- well I have been here

a year and I am just learning about it, that is why I am just reading about it, and it is obviously something I should be paying some attention to. Hopefully, I will personally participate this morning, I hope positively, productively, and from what I have been reading I expect it will be generally of that sort.

So welcome to Banff, welcome to this rather good facility, it is built for what you are doing here today, and have a good meeting. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you, Jim. Next I would like to call on our Executive Officer, Mr. Alistair Crerar for a welcome from the Environment Council of Alberta.

MR. CRERAR: Thanks Joe, and welcome members of P.A.C. to what is -- I don't know whether this is the 11th or 12th, it is getting to be fairly long in the tooth, except that we keep renewing ourselves, and I will be talking about that later on, about that part of it. You know, when it was suggested that we might hold a meeting of the Environment Council in Banff, I wondered about the propriety of it, and particularly whether this Centre was an appropriate place to hold such a meeting. You know how it is with advanced educational establishments, they are footloose. They can be located anywhere, and have been. They have been located in downtown slums, in suburban communities, in frontier agricultural service centres, and on mountaintops like here. And why do you locate an advanced educational centre here? Because education is competitive, would you sooner study music in the Mount Royal Campus, and anybody from Calgary you do not need to answer that, or to study it here? Would you sooner study business management on the banks of the North Saskatchewan or here? Would you sooner hold a conference in Fort McMurray or here? The difference between these two is of course the recreational edge, and that is what this conference is about, recreation. And where better to consider recreation than in the midst of this paradox, and

that is what we are, a paradox at the Banff Centre.

It is in a gorgeous recreational setting where we will have meetings for 14 or 15 hours each day, starting at 8 o'clock, so that we utilize all the sunlight or the ability to recreate. Where the only free time is already scheduled for us, that's recreation, after the light is gone and you can't appreciate all the beauty that is here.

So this reflects the paradox that is recreation. We know that it is essential for a complete person, but there is also something a little frivolous about it, or maybe that is just my Presbyterian background. And what better place to contemplate the paradox of recreation than here, to consider recreation in Banff at a serious conference, that is what it is, in a serious educational institution, in an area set aside for the use and enjoyment of the public forever.

Thank you very much, welcome to Banff, have a good time recreating and contemplating.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you, Alistair. I see that we are just a bit ahead of schedule, but that does not mean that we have to stop and wait until 9 o'clock. So what I would do now is turn over this meeting to Mrs. Dorothy Broadbent who will chair the next session, which is Tourism and The National Parks. Mrs. Broadbent?

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Good morning fellow P.A.C. members, you all look so bright and chipper, especially Betty Meier. It is just like old times to have Betty back here with us, I think she is enjoying herself this time, she is on our side of the podium.

The topic this morning is Tourism and The National Parks, and I think it is a very appropriate subject for our meeting here in Banff this morning, because this particular national park attracts a great number of tourists; it is a year-round resort having something to offer at every season of the year. I think we all know that and appreciate it. Some of us come here just to enjoy the scenery, others come to hike and ski

in the back country, and some soulless individuals drive here from all over the continent, make it to the main street of Banff and stay there enjoying the stores and restaurants and the other watering holes.

In the wintertime, hordes of downhill skiiers place pressures on the townsite and on the three ski resorts in the area. I might mention that there is the best skiing here than anywhere in North America, or at least it's equivalent.

People pressures are increasing annually in this park and administrators must wrestle with the problems of preserving parks for the enjoyment of people, and at the same time protecting them from overuse; it is a double-edged sword. People come to enjoy the mountains and the freedom found in remote places, but their very being there destroys the wilderness. Fragile habitats and sensitive species such as grizzly bears can not compete with people.

Our four speakers this morning will discuss the problems associated with the managing of a national park. One speaker from the Chamber of Commerce will discuss the problems of living and operating a business within the park system. It is my pleasure this morning to call upon Steve Kun, Director of Western Region, Parks Canada; Dr. Bruce Leeson, Bruce is special advisor, National History and Research Division, Western Region, Parks Canada; and also Jim Vollmershausen, I know he is here and David Morrisson, Chairman of the Banff Chamber of Commerce.

Directly on my left is Steve Kun, he is one of those rare individuals, a native born Albertan, I haven't met very many of them. He is Director of Western Region, Parks Canada. He has held that post since November 1982. His responsibilities include nine national parks, four historic parks and more than a hundred historic sites in Alberta and British Columbia. He is formerly Director of the National Parks Branch in Ottawa. He is responsible for planning and negotiating new park acquisitions, and for development of policies and regulations for managing the existing system. His many years

experience includes Superintendent of Banff National Park, and Prince Albert National Park in Saskatchewan, and he has done a stint as Assistant Chief of Operations for the National Parks Service in Ottawa.

He is a graduate of the University of British Columbia, he has a Masters degree in forestry, and he was first employed by Parks Canada as a forester in Jasper in 1955. He subsequently became a forester for National Parks in the four western provinces developing forest fire protection plans, and giving training programs for park wardens. He presently resides in Calgary.

Bruce Leeson, I think we all know or have heard of Bruce Leeson. He is Special Adviser, Natural History and Research Division, Western Region, Parks Canada. He has been employed for 12 or 13 years with Parks Canada. Presently -- well, he has in the past been engaged in environmental impact assessments for major development projects in the Western Region including the controversial CN and CP Rail upgrading project and the Rogers Pass Tunnel, the Trans-Canada Highway twinning and the ski developments.

He has a Ph.D. in environmental planning from the Montana State University, an M.Sc. from the University of Guelph in regional planning, a B.Sc. from the University of Guelph, so you see he is a very experienced and well rounded individual, and I'm sure he will be an interesting and informative speaker.

To Steve's left is Jim Vollmershausen, he is the present Superintendent of Banff National Park over the past year. Before coming here he was Superintendent of the Cape Breton Highland National Park in Nova Scotia and the Gros Morne National Park on the west coast of Newfoundland.

He has had a lot of experience in park management, although I imagine he finds his present position to be his biggest challenge. 1985 marks Parks Canada's centennial, and Banff is planning to celebrate, because as you know, Parks Canada started right here in Banff. I am sure you will find

that Jim is a most interesting person.

Our last speaker on my extreme left is David Morrisson, to give us the businessman's perspective. He is Chairman of the Banff Chamber of Commerce and President and Chief Executive Officer of Brewster Transport Company. I think anyone who is familiar with skiing Sunshine will remember those buses that made that horrendous trip up that hill, and I think we all will be interested to hear the businessman's perspective.

With that, I will call upon our first speaker, Steve Kun.

MR. KUN: Thank you Chairperson, it is always a pleasure to be in Banff amongst people who have some interest in the environment, and it is always a pleasure to have somebody remind me of other parts of Canada. I heard the word paradox this morning, and I have a friend who says that is a couple of mallards flying over Winnipeg. Got it, anybody?

Well, I'm afraid to get into trying to tell jokes, I just use up all my time, and I would not get my message across to you. I have a message that I want to get across to you, and I want to thank those who have invited me here today, because I do think the subject is one that is well worthy of the attention of all of us. I will try to stick close to the written text here, so I don't wander too much, and I will spend some time with you today.

I will stick close to my text, and I will leave a copy or two around with anybody that might be interested. I want to spend some of the day with you, I'd like to hear the views of some of the members in the audience today about what they think of when they think of tourism.

First off, a hundred years ago, the only intrusion into the solitude and nature of this valley was the clang of steel and the smell of sweating men and horses. They were building a railway. That was a railway that was to help tie together this country called Canada.

Two years after they got going at that, a couple of fellows saw the steam rising off the side of Sulphur Mountain, and they said, "Hey, there is something good there, we will explore it", and they found that there was a hot springs there. They undertook to acquire the hot springs, made application to the government, the government considered their application, but decided to keep the hot springs in the public interest.

Those three ingredients I just mentioned accessed the railway, the prospect of private enterprise, entrepreneurs interested in getting on with private enterprise, plus the government's desire to remain in control, or to keep in the public domain the key natural resources of some of these beautiful areas was a basic ingredient of our tourism business today. It is the basic ingredient of tourism in most countries, and the partnership between government and private enterprise in parks and tourism is very common throughout the world.

Parks Canada is the agency responsible for the operation of a nationwide system of nationally significant parks. They operate a total budget of $260,000,000 a year, over $70,000,000 of that is spent here in the region that I am responsible for.

In Canada's national parks there are many things, and I would like to give you an idea of the dimensions of those things that contribute to what people visualize as being tourism.

There are 2400 kilometers of public roads, the distance from here to Sault Ste. Marie.

There are 3300 kilometers of constructed trails, the distance from here to Windsor, Ontario.

There are 15,000 campsites.

There is commercial accommodation for 18,000 people, that is the equivalent of 16 Banff Springs Hotels.

There are several hundred cottages and other private units.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Kun)

There are five ski areas with a daily capacity of over 25,000.

There are five tramways or lifts operated for summer sightseeing purposes.

There are seven government and two privately operated golf courses.

There are six public swimming pools.

There are tens of thousands of picnic sites.

There are several marinas.

There are many visitor reception and interpretation centres, and interpretive signs and exhibits along the trails throughout the park too numerous to count.

Altogether, Parks Canada generates 26,000,000 visitors annually, equal to the country's population. An expenditure of over a billion dollars, that is generated expenditure by the private enterprise government, and results in more than 38,000 jobs. Much of this employment is created in rural areas where employment and opportunities for employment is far too few.

Today Canada has 29 national parks, at least one in each province or territory, making up 1.3 percent of the country's landscape. In spite of this, the system is only 40 percent complete. It is 40 percent complete when compared to the fact that we are endeavoring to follow a plan, approved by Cabinet, that has called for the establishment of one national park in each of the major natural regions of the country. That in total would require 48 national parks.

It is interesting that 90 percent of Canada's national parks are on lands located in the west and the north, while 60 percent of Canada's population is located within 10 miles of the St. Lawrence River and its watershed.

We have come a long way in Parks Canada in managing the natural resources, and we have had some success in managing for people, but we have not done as well on the people side as we have on the natural resources side. We don't have the same professional match-up, we are a strong environmental

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Kun)

science-planning-engineering organization. We now supervise pretty good road construction, we are getting better at constructing good campsites. We are doing not too badly at maintaining a pure environment. We generally deny what is ugly, but we do quite often miss the boat in dealing with people.

We have yet to reach a balance in our mandate of having sound preservation and a continual offering to the public on the use side of our responsibilities.

Some good strides have been taken by our interpretation people. They are doing an increasingly better job, they are doing not a bad job at making visitors aware of their surroundings. We offer good slide shows, we administer a good dose of education about the great outdoors. We say, "Don't feed the animals". We say "Leave only footprints and take only pictures", in the nicest possible way. Some people say our brochures read, though, like the Ten Commandments, spelling out what not to do.

What we have not done enough is show them how to feel about this inheritance. What we have not done is show them how to enjoy it and feel a part of it using all their senses. I do not have figures, but only a small proportion of our park visitors ever get into the back country, ever walk a trail, ever been into a canoe in the mountains, ever climb a mountain, or ever glimpse the beauty of the next valley.

Some visitors are physically incapable of doing all these strenuous things, others are afraid of the unknown, while others simply do not have the skills to do them.

Not, to my knowledge, have we ever assessed the mental needs of those who come to our parks. We have never measured anything other than their obvious recreational needs - neat campsite, clean facilities and peace and quiet. "Take it or leave it, that's what we've got."

I think we should be more interested in their healthful pursuits and their physical wellbeing. I think we have an obligation in urging them to embrace heritage, to give them

an opportunity to know what that heritage is all about, but more importantly, to help them get a real feel for it.

Those of us who have been involved in or highly interested in the park business have had the opportunity, training and back-up systems to experience the remote places, to climb some mountains, hike the trails, see the grizzly and wolverine in the wilds. To us it is a thrill, it is fun and it's memorable.

Accepting park protection as a first priority, our next interest must be to show those who come here how to best maximize their inheritance. We have to awaken their senses to what lies beyond the Trans-Canada Highway. We have to accept, and this is a balancing act for us, that to feel a park means to see it and touch it. How can the wilderness be understood if man can not reach it?

We have built roads, parkways, trails and viewpoints. Now I think it is time to build a bridge to a better understanding with our visitors on what national parks and our historic sites are all about. Those we have made headway in this field, Parks Canada's batting average is just that - average.

Between posing the problem and providing a solution rests a real gulf of ignorance. Many regulations have been passed during the years to protect the wilderness, but in parks we have not paid sufficient attention to setting qualifications for the users.

We have to know our existing and potential customers better. We have to understand their shortcomings and their strengths in being able to appreciate and enjoy parks. We must learn how to take them through the steps of increasing park appreciation and use from the first introduction to mature use of all that the parks have to offer. Above all, we must constantly remind ourselves that the interface between people and nature provides the park experience. This need to interface is our greatest challenge and will provide us with our greatest rewards.

I think it is inevitable that we have to get into the area of skill development, particularly those visitors who want to penetrate the wider reaches of the wilderness. They have to acquire the skills. We can not conserve the parks and have happy customers if we do not educate the users.

We have to take a more aggressive role in developing back country skills, and that means going far beyond teaching visitors how to light a fire. Our mountain rescue service is second to none in the world. We spent a lot of money hauling climbers out of dangerous and tricky spots. We put our wardens at considerable risk in carrying out these rescues. We train them well and provide them with the best equipment, but our participation in developing and encouraging safe climbing techniques among amateurs is not nearly at the same level.

I am concerned that people are not being better prepared to use and enjoy the great outdoors. We need to pay more attention to those who engage in activities in our parks, and in my view, it is not enough just to effect rescues to those in trouble. We need to be out on the front end of the activity business, helping visitors to develop their abilities so they can effectively enjoy the parks, protect the natural values and avoid trouble. Anyone who has recently learned how to cross-country ski properly will attest to the fact that knowing how to prepare and use your equipment changes frustration and sheer agony into an exhilarating experience.

We are increasingly recognizing in Parks Canada the requirement to better match up visitor expectations and opportunities. We need to encourage visitors to select appropriate activities, and we have an obligation to provide the essential support services and facilities. And, we have to be mindful of the economic and resource limitations of the parks.

Visitor activity planning is part of the park management planning process, and Parks Canada is gradually coming to

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Kun)

grips with this. I would like to be able to say it is a fully developed visitor activity program, but we don't have it. We are working on it. We are in the final process of dotting the i's and crossing the t's and running some pilot project to see how the system develops. I would hope that within the next 18 months we will have a system that will be applied throughout our system.

We lack a comprehensive information base on the public and park visitor activities. We require information on needs, opportunities and public expectations in order to plan.

We have gone so far as to set objectives, and now we are filling in the framework of the structure to provide visitors with a better sense of the heritage that is contained in each park. We have to become more professional in dealing with people, and as far as I am concerned, I intend to do just that.

The public attitude in the late '60's and the early '70's generated a wave of environmental concern. This was helpful in promoting preservation of national parks. As a matter of fact, during that period we got ten new parks. The pendulum is now swinging toward economic stimulation through tourism. Park visitors are tourists. National parks are tourist destination centres. There is much pressure to do more with parks for tourism. My view is we can.

This can only come, though, if we plan well. We must have that better knowledge of what we are working with, our client, the park visitor, the tourist who is also our guest. If you have a good knowledge of what you are working with and what influences it, or manipulates it, then you can manage it.

I am confident that with good knowledge we can make fuller use of what we already have, rather than building new things. We must become more professional in managing the people side of the preservation and use equation. Some folks say that we know our grizzly bears far better than our park visitors, and that's probably true.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Kun)

This people question does not just relate to the visitor, it also extends to those who reside in the vicinity of the park, as well as in the park. Denying local people resource use of the parks, while appearing to encourage large numbers of strangers to track through their back yards, requires a great deal of understanding by all parties.

The tourism industry in Canada is repeatedly being told that Canada is losing out because tourists are claiming they do not get value for their money. We need to pull up our socks and ensure that we are adequately trained in hospitality and welcoming of park guests. We must know their needs and satisfy them, so they can better enjoy the park experience.

To make the point there let's pretend that there is a big show being put on at our Eric Harvie Theatre right next door. You are on the way to see that show, however you got tied up in doing things and you didn't get a chance to eat, but you say to yourself, when I get to the theatre I'll get a bite to eat there. On the way to the theatre, you got a flat tire, it's raining outside, you got all wet while changing the flat tire. Big delay, oh, I've got to go to the bathroom too, good Lord, arrive at the Eric Harvie Theatre, the bathroom's out of order. Besides, it is almost curtain call, got to get in there. You have just gone through some of the normal feelings of human beings when things don't go just right, or particularly when they are in a strange environment. You are soaking wet, you haven't gone to the bathroom, you haven't eaten, and maybe you didn't even find a good place to park your car and you don't know about that flat tire and whether the spare is going to stand up or not.

You go into the theatre, it can be the finest show on earth, but you are in no condition to enjoy that show. It is the same thing in the park business. We can have the finest interpretive program and the most spectacular scenery, however, if we do not think through and provide for the bodily needs of the individuals, and recognize that they are in a strange territory, then we are missing the boat.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Kuhl)

Canada's national park centennial comes in 1985. We will celebrate the creation of Banff National Park and the birth of the national parks system in Canada. The theme will be a hundred years of conservation of heritage places in Canada.

It has great potential for an outstanding national celebration with substantial tourism benefits. This celebration should bring parks and their role in society back into the spotlight. Hopefully, it will serve as a catalyst toward completion of the national parks system.

I am promoting a number of park visitor/tourist/guest oriented objectives for the centennial year. You listen to all that other stuff I told you, because I really wanted to get to this. We should be calling park visitors or tourists guests, and treating them as such.

We should be inventorying and knowing those guests as well as we know our park natural resources.

We should be matching law enforcement training of our staff with equal time in hospitality training.

We should be having on staff more people trained in social sciences and recreology, and this isn't just because George Priddle is sitting up in the audience.

We should be having park concessionaires and conservation interests and recreation associations working together to present a full range of skill development programs.

If we can follow these objectives, or move towards them by 1985, I am sure we will have more people having more fun in the parks, they will be much healthier, and much more supportive of the total parks system. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Thank you Steve. One thought came to mind, I think park visitors must be taught to behave like guests in the parks.

I will now ask you to welcome Bruce Leeson, he will give us a look into the role of research advisory, Parks Canada. Bruce?

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Leeson)

DR. LEESON: Thank you, Mrs. Broadbent, and thank you ladies and gentlemen for inviting me to attend your sessions, I would like to use my time to tell you about some of the projects going on in some of the national parks that are related to tourism, and impacted by tourism, or impact on tourism in some way or another. And lest we forget that there are more parks than just Banff in the National Parks, Western Region, I would like to describe some of the things that are going on in other parks that seem to be very remote when you're residing in such a fine surroundings as you are this morning.

In Jasper National Park, one of the continuing difficulties with regard to the human impact on the park is in the area of wildlife management. There is very fine big game hunting all along the eastern boundary, and some of the finest animals are located in Jasper Park, and it is a continuing problem with frustrated hunters hunting along the edge of the park who decided to take the big chance to cross the boundary and get the animal that they can see on the other side. This most frequently involves big horn sheep and grizzly bears, and is a continuing problem of tourist activity in the Province of Alberta, but it relates to illegal activity in Jasper Park.

Killing of animals in all of the national parks in the Western Region is a problem, though. Those of you who keep track of such things would have seen the most spectacular activity of the past two or three years with an international poaching ring that was operated partly in Banff and Jasper National Park where photographs were literally taken of some of the largest animals, most spectacular animals in the park and were made available in catalogues to wealthy people around the world who could have hunts arranged for these individual animals. Well, they were caught, and so the problems of hunting for trophies in the last year or two, hunting for meat and most surprisingly, wanton killing has become a more common problem in all of the parks of the

Western Region.

Just before I leave Jasper, I want to mention that there we have an interesting situation that we are trying to deal with where commercial horseshoes is an activity historically in Jasper Park, and commercial operators would like to expand their operation. In Jasper Park we have quite strict regulations regarding the number of horses and where they can go, and Jasper essentially is a very wet park, and the impact with horses is quite dramatic. So we are trying to deal with that situation with respect to interest in expanding commercial horse outfitting and the conflicts that it creates for pedestrian travellers in the park and for damage to the environment.

In Elk Island National Park, east of Edmonton, the increasing demand for day hiking and cross-country skiing has led Parks Canada to the position within the past six months that we have decided to open up a portion of Elk Island Park that has always been called an isolation area. No one other than park managers and scientists has visited the parks for many, many years, and it is isolated for the prime purpose of maintaining a protective gene pool of wood buffalo in Canada. Canada has the largest population of wood buffalo in the world and we have a special obligation to maintain the purity, and that was always done for many, many years in the south side of Elk Island Park. We have been successful in establishing wood buffalo herds in other parks, we have wood buffalo that are on display here at Banff, so we feel that the isolation area is no longer necessary for that purpose.

We now have a challenge of developing visitor facilities in areas which have a very fragile environment on the Cooking Lake Moraine, which is an environment that is under increasing pressure throughout all of Alberta, and the piece of it that has been preserved is a true glass case, and is now about to be exposed to all the impact of a tourist visitation.

Rocky Mountain House National Historic Park is the only national historic park in Alberta, located just west of Rocky

Mountain House on the North Saskatchewan River, is under pressure in a way that affects tourism in a rather unique way. Not that the tourists are affecting the park, but rather industrial activity that is proposed to take place about 120 miles upstream has a very significant concern for Rocky Mountain House National Historic Park, and that is the TransAlta Utilities Limited which controls the flow of the North Saskatchewan River through Big Horn Dam has been operating the winter flow level of the river at about one-third capacity of the dam electric generating capacity. And they have done so because of flow regulations in excess, or flow release in excess of what has been produced would greatly threaten backwater flooding at Rocky Mountain House, and particularly at the park. Well, with the increasing demand for electric power throughout the Province of Alberta, and the fact that hydro generated power is the most economical, there is interest in realizing the capacity that has never been used. But the implications for the park is that the premier historic site of all Alberta could be destroyed, and we are presently engaged in a study in cooperation with TransAlta, and they are very cooperative about this, to try and determine whether to protect the park, which represents both a natural history resource and a cultural history resource of magnificent proportions, the environment that is there now is the same environment that existed in terms of trees and landscape as what was there when David Thompson first went there, and when Anthony Henday first laid eyes on the Rocky Mountains.

In Yoho National Park, that is west of Banff, there is no electric power that is connected to any of the great systems. All of the electric power in Yoho National Park is generated by diesel generators, and because the cost of doing that with fossil fuels depleting so rapidly, the situation has attracted the attention of a private entrepreneur, a company that goes about North America installing small hydro-electric facilities, and this company is proposing to install such a

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Leeson)

system in Yoho National Park. All except one of the commercial tourist operations, and including Parks Canada Field Administrative Centre, have indicated their interest in purchasing the electric power that this hydro company will produce. The challenge for us is that during the low flow period of the Kicking Horse River, which is right now, and on which the hydro generating facilities would be located, would require the complete Kicking Horse River, the complete flow to be put through the generating penstock, there would be no more Kicking Horse River for about four or five months of the year.

That becomes an interesting challenge for us in providing modern day expectations such as electric power to tourists at a cost that a person could probably afford. The way it has been, electricity costs about five times as much in Yoho National Park as it does anywhere else, and the residents of the place were literally lighting their homes with candles and running the furnace seasonally for very short periods of time.

In Kootenay National Park we have a tourism impact problem which relates very strongly to Albertans, particularly Calgarians, because so many Calgarians own recreational property in the East Kootenays, and in Panorama, which has developed into a year-round resort, and the conflict there occurs with high speed traffic, people in a heck of a hurry to get from Calgary to the Windermere Valley, and continually running over our elk; on the Windermere highway there is a lot of animals killed, a lot of car crashes on that highway, and without any prospects for resolution of the conflict of the sort that we are accomplishing on the Trans-Canada Highway, and which I will tell you about shortly.

In Waterton Parks, there most recently and tragically the conflict between Parks Canada's mandate to protect and preserve a unique habitat and a unique species, the grizzly bear, came into conflict with our second mandate, that is to provide recreation opportunities for tourists. The difficulty

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Leeson)

of doing this is simply a gut wrenching challenge, it is a very, very difficult situation to try and deal with, and the chances are it could get worse.

In Glacier and Revelstoke National Park, you might think that is a long ways away from Albertans tourist impact, but the activity that is going on there will have an impact on tourism, not so much tourism but the project Canadian Pacific Rail is undertaking to reduce the grade in Beaver Valley going over Rogers Pass, which is an activity of massive proportions, and one of the very largest engineering projects ever undertaken in Canada in recent years. Not as large, of course, as the James Bay project in Quebec, but still a project requiring expenditures of $650,000,000, 1982 dollars. About one half of that, about $350,000,000 of that will be spent on rearranging the face of the earth in Glacier Park, and it will be in a position that every traveller on the Trans-Canada Highway, either eastbound or westbound, will have a theatre box view of, consequently we are these days engaged in heavy weather negotiations with CP Rail to determine performance standards that will be required of them in constructing these works in a way which minimizes the impact on the parks. That it is a challenge of major proportions, and because this is such an important undertaking, and such a massive project, that for the first time ever our agreement of environmental protection will take the form of the law of the land. It will become an Order-In-Council for the House of Cabinet in Ottawa, and we feel that there is a requirement of CP to perform in such a way -- it's so important that we have undertaken to make the agreement of that level of importance.

Now, in Banff I will use the rest of my time and go quickly, and be glad to talk about any of these subjects afterwards. The Trans-Canada Highway, I presume all of you came in a vehicle from the east, and you would have seen the improvements and work going on along the Trans-Canada Highway. That is a project between the east gate and the Sunshine

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Leeson)

turnoff, seven miles west of Banff, at which we will spend approximately $53,000,000 twinning the highway and constructing associated works. With regards to concern for the tourists and the environmental impact, about eight percent of those funds will be used in environmental protection, for environmental protection purposes, landscaping, very special landscaping for visual effects is being pursued, and although it might be hard to see these today with all the snow on it, it has been held up as one of the best accomplishments in Canada at this time with regards to sympathetic land and terrain impact in highway construction. You probably would have noticed a new and major feature in Banff National Park, that large fence that is on each side of the first five kilometers of the highway. The purpose of that fence is to be able to keep the animals, the large animals off the roadway, because that part of Bow Valley is a very important elk wintering range, and it will be particularly so this year from the heavy winter that seems to be setting in, that will allow the animals to migrate from the side valleys and concentrate in the lower part of the Bow Valley. Last night when I arrived in Banff it looked as if there were about 65 head of elk just immediately west of what used to be the traffic circle. Up until this point, we were getting about 100 elk killed on the highway between the Bow River crossing west of Banff and the east gate of Banff every year. About every three days our Warden Service was required to go out to the highway and remove the remains of large animals, most particularly it was an elk, probably an equal number of animals were struck and injured and managed to get into the forest before they died. The cost to car drivers two years ago was approximately $2400 for every crash. It has been quite a while since we have had a fatality that could be directly attributed to an accident with an animal, although there have been a number of single vehicle accidents, also head-on collisions, in which all people were killed. It is suspected in view of these

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Leeson)

instances, that they were precipitated by evasive action on the part of one of the drivers to miss an animal which caused a tragic accident.

While a terrific amount of environmental protection work is being provided through the construction of this highway, it is the most impressive setting in Canada, particularly the wildlife fencing, and if you look closely you will see bridges that seem to be constructed for no purpose, no roads go to them. Well, they are animal underpasses in order that wildlife can use the habitat in which they always have, and it looks very prospective that they will use them. They have already started to, and once we have finished tying in all the fences, there is no reason to think that they won't be successful.

The Bow Valley Parkway is being rebuilt from Banff to Lake Louise, and that is part of the Trans-Canada Highway twinning project. We are rebuilding it as a pleasant drive for slow moving traffic, providing a lot of visitor interpretive stops, because when the Trans-Canada Highway is constructed that will ultimately lead someplace, it is a high speed roadway all the way through the park, there will not be opportunities for people to stop along the Trans-Canada Highway. That is one of the big reasons, one of the major reasons for twinning the Trans-Canada Highway is to separate the destination oriented high speed travel, both tourist and commercial, from the park travellers which poke along trying to see things and trying to decide whether they are going the right way or not, or whatever they want to do in a fashion that conflicts with high speed traffic.

Ski area planning, particularly in Banff, high profile activities for the past seven or eight years, we now have approved plans, ministerial approved plans for Lake Louise ski area and Sunshine ski area. Within a year or shortly thereafter, we hope to also have approved plans for Marmot Basin in Jasper and Norquay in Banff. And upon accomplishing that, it is our Minister's intention that these plans and

boundaries will be legislated through the House of Commons. Issues associated with ski area planning most frequently revolve around slope stability, soil erosion and conflict with wildlife, particularly for example goats and grizzly bears at Lake Louise.

Speaking of ski area planning, that brings up the issue of the Winter Olympics in 1988, and whether Banff National Park or whether Lake Louise ski area will have a role to play. Now, we do not know, we have not been asked. We have had considerable discussion with OCCO 88 with regards to what it is they might ask for if they were to ask. Those are important words, I am not double-talking. Maybe we will know in a week or so, and I can tell you more about that if you care to later.

In the back country, Mr. Kun referred to most of the people visiting the parks not knowing the parks, well that was dramatically true: 95 percent of all of the people who visit these parks do not get more than one-quarter of a mile away from their vehicle at any time during their visit. In the back country, the five percent who go there are really expecting something special, and of course it is special, and they get very upset over the condition of some of the trails, particularly the circumstances that are created by horses. Horses are a traditional and historic means of travelling in the parks, and we would like to be able to reserve that opportunity. But the cost of building trails in the back country is incredible, it approaches building an asphalt highway.

The townsite of Banff, this place which many people in the world think is the whole National Park System of Canada, is a very, very special problem for us. It consumes a terrific amount of time and effort and finances, and in recent years, there has been a special concern that the potential for uncontrolled horizontal growth in Banff was about to affect some very special environments that surround the town. Some people became aware of that and made a submission to the Minister that he ought to be very careful and rigorous about

what was taking place here. The previous Minister responded to that request by establishing a moratorium of development of new land outside of the townsite boundary until we could accomplish a detailed inventory of the environment which immediately surrounds the town to determine what is special or unique or fragile about it, and that information would become an important parameter in deciding the future of Banff, and how we would accommodate new facilities, services and tourists. And some very interesting things are being found. One of them is that this place where these buildings are located, surrounding us, the land that surrounds these buildings constitutes the very best mule deer range that you could see. If you went outside of here on a clear day and looked all the way around 360 degrees, you would be standing right on top of the very best mule deer range that is within your whole view and this is precious. If you drive up the road here you will see new hotels being built, roads being improved, hostels recently being constructed, there is pressure on all of these lands, and I could tell you half a dozen other special stories like that in areas surrounding the town. This is truly a challenge of immense proportions to protect these lands, and to also accommodate the tourism, the services expected by visitors to the park.

I will stop at that point, and be glad to elaborate on any of these points later. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Thank you, Bruce, that was most interesting, and I am sure you are all itching to ask questions.

I will now call on Jim Vollmershausen to tell us about a specific park, this one here in Banff. Jim?

MR. VOLLMERSHAUSEN: Thanks very much. We are getting from the global to the more specific. Steve was talking about a system across the country, Bruce was talking about our region, and I notice that both of them got to mention Banff during that process. I would like to talk to you about

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Vollmershausen)

a few specific examples of efforts that we are going through in this park to deal with that question of tourism, recreation and increased pressure to both of those areas. When Mrs. Broadbent was telling you a little bit about my background, she mentioned Gros Morne National Park, and I was remembering that when I was there, Parks Canada was trying to come to grips with a system with accommodation, and I got one of my early tastes there of the impact that this part of Parks Canada system out here can have on our whole system because I was confronted with a proposed set of guidelines and policies and so on that was totally geared to reacting to fairly extensive pressures to provide accommodation in a national park and how we reacted to that once the constraints were in place. And there I was in Gros Morne National Park begging people please build a motel here so people can stay somewhere. Not necessarily in the park, but even near the park would have been nice, and I was having trouble doing that, and here my own organization we would dig our heels in.

It is interesting how, one of the reasons I was interested in coming out to the western part of our system was to get a real first-hand taste of where a lot of our policies and a lot of our directives and so on emanate from, because they certainly do that. I will just go down the list, some of which have been touched on a little bit. Bruce Leeson was talking a little bit about the Town of Banff, and many of you know, or most of you know I expect that in the last ten years there has been a great deal of development, or redevelopment in the town. For various reasons that has slowed, in my time here in the last year there has only been two or three major development proposals of the kind that were fairly frequent in the years preceding. In some ways that makes my job a little easier, at the same time those projects in themselves are not insignificant, so we still find ourselves worrying about that.

The environmental review that Bruce referred to will be an important step in helping us determine just how the town

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Vollmershausen)

will look, what the boundaries of the town, where they will be located. I have a feeling that the boundaries of the town will never be much bigger than they presently are, and the town will always be faced with the problem of infilling and redevelopment, for example, to meet some of the objectives that people have in the town. The need to reside policy which -- Steve, I don't know if you have a need to reside here anyway.

But that policy will be in effect in one form or another, I expect, for some time to come. The staff accommodation problem is still in place, and the policy that was developed some time ago that requires any new commercial developments that are proposed and developed in this town have attached to them staff accommodation, although there are those that suggest that there are vacancies in this town for the first time in many years, and are suggesting that we should be reviewing that policy. There are others that say it's just a momentary aberration.

Steve was talking about, and Bruce too, about all the people that come to Banff and don't get very far out of the town, or don't get out of the town at all. We are trying to come to grips with that in the context of both, the development of interpretive management units for the town that has identified a whole series of exhibits, texts, displays, et cetera, within the town that will expose people to what is out there, in some cases only a hundred feet from where they are standing. And obviously we will be encouraging our guests to experience some of those opportunities, and in some cases, they certainly don't have to go very far to do that.

Visitation, by the way, there was some mention that the pressures keep going on, Dave Morrisson may suggest that it is not going up; in fact our statistics are suggesting the last couple of years it is going down six or eight percent a year. That is in all areas, camping, people entering the park at the east gate and so on. But there is still lots of

people around, all right.

There has been various mention of the federal-provincial level initiatives in the tourism area, tourism is being viewed more and more as a means in this province to promote diversification of the economy and so on. Whenever that subject comes up, obviously the mountain parks and Banff tends to get singled out as a place where there is a destination if we ever saw one, and there may be some opportunities to do more. We are trying to deal with that in the context of a park planning process that is currently underway. It is trying to deal with the futures aspect of our business, and give us some direction over the short and immediate term. But how we are going to deal with tourism, how we are going to deal with proposals to deal with tourism in the park, deal with increased interest in the back country and so on? Hopefully in March of this coming year we will be talking to the public one more time in that park planning context, and we will be talking in the context of alternatives, and we will be asking people to give us their views. For example, about maximizing tourism, or minimizing, or that sort of discussion. And we are hoping for some good directions for that process.

That plan we will be talking, for example, about outlying commercial accommodation. Once you leave the Town of Banff you get on to the Trans-Canada Highway, the Banff-Jasper Highway, Banff-Windermere Highway, those roads are all dotted with what we call outlying commercial accommodation. What is their role, should they be allowed to expand, should they be providing overnight accommodation? Those kinds of questions we are trying to answer as part of this mountain park planning process, and they will be looked at one at a time and dealt with individually in that process.

Another mechanism that we are looking at having to do with tourism and recreation is something we call privatization. Steve mentioned a number of golf courses, swimming pools, that are carried through the national park system. Those

kinds of facilities are in an area that we look at as an activity or facility that most often is operated by the private sector. In many ways, in many places, they are operated better than we can operate them. We are looking seriously in this park, for example, at privatizing the upper hot springs. We haven't fully reached a conclusion on doing that, but it's a facility that requires a great deal of capital investment over the next few years, and the question we are asking ourselves and will be asking the public is there a private sector interested in undertaking that capitalization and operating the upper hot springs.

Golf courses are another facility that is being looked at in that context. We don't have to worry about that here in Banff, they are already privatized, but other parks here are looking at it.

One of the gems of the national park system, of the whole system within this park is Lake Louise. Lake Louise has been viewed over the years by many as an eyesore, an unfortunate train of events that led to the development of temporary accommodation and the development of a government compound there smack on the Trans-Canada Highway that was not at all attractive. In the last few years we have been able to develop a plan for Lake Louise that we feel will deal with both aesthetic problems that were in place there, and there were certainly problems. We feel it will deal with the question of accommodating visitors. We feel it will upgrade the environment around Lake Louise, a great deal of rehabilitation is involved in the plans for Lake Louise. It is a multi-year $40,000,000 investment on our part. We are, for example, upgrading infrastructure, just beginning to operate a brand new sewage treatment plant out there that was funded to the extent of I think it was about $4.1 million. It seemed like a large amount of money to spend on a relatively small number of permanent residents, but it will serve an awful lot of people year-round. We are building a major visitor reception centre in Lake Louise that we hope

will be used by a goodly number of people and will give them an opportunity to have a look at such issues, or such events as mountain building, and we will be concentrating as well on things like flora and fauna as well as mountain building. My main concern with mountain building is I don't mind how much we talk about it as long as we don't refer to primordial ooze, we have done that to the nth degree.

The hope is, of course, with Lake Louise, that we are intending to spend $40,000,000 or so by 1986 or 1987. During that time and following it, the private sector, either the commercial operations that are already placed, the plan calls for their ability to expand within the capacity of their present situation. There is allowance for a hostel in Lake Louise, there is provision for a small mall there to serve both residents and visitors. Hopefully all that will get off the ground in the next five years and we will see Lake Louise becoming not another Banff, not another town, but rather a visitor or guest reception service centre that will do and meet most of our objectives without getting in trouble.

Some of you -- moving on from Lake Louise and coming back to Banff for a minute, one of the things that has been in the news, not recently thank goodness, is the water. You will be happy to know that the water you are drinking today is Giardia free, guaranteed, personally guaranteed. This has been an interesting problem, in fact the reason I would like to talk a bit about it is because it hit the national news and was very big for some time a year or so ago, a year and some ago, and of course was caused by an intestinal parasite which unfortunately for the beaver was associated with that particular animal, and spawned the term beaver-fever. For a while there we had the uncomfortable feeling that Giardia existed only in Banff, that nowhere else in the world would we find this particular problem. I think it is well documented now in fact that it is everywhere. In fact, the Alberta standards for water, domestic water says that any surface supply must be filtered. The only alternative, and

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Vollmershausen)

the alternative we have been able to take advantage of is a groundwater supply for drinking is totally out of wells. Soon we will have our nice new reservoir built and it will be foolproof -- I shouldn't say that, it is intended to be foolproof.

The side effect of this Giardia thing is back country, and we have found that in fact any surface water supply, and many of our water supplies outside of Banff are surface supplies, so suddenly we have found ourselves warning people that when you enter what has become or has been talked about as pure environment, the wilderness of the Rocky Mountains, that boiled water is the best for drinking. That is occurring province-wide, and I would expect regionally-wide in B.C. as well. It is unfortunate, but a fact of life.

The last thing that I would like to talk a bit about, Steve got into it, is the centennial program that we are entering into. Here in Banff just recently we are just about to sign a contract with an individual who will act as coordinator for us to help the park and the town celebrate our hundredth anniversary of this park, and make sure that those events are of a high enough quality that they will be of significance nationally. The cave and basin, of course, is the keystone of our centennial program. It's, for a change, for a government program, ahead of schedule, and under budget. I am really, really very happy with it. There are some interpretive facilities going in there that technology-wise are state-of-the-art. The pool itself, of course, has been redeveloped. There is some really excellent trails associated with the cave and basin, and that gets people down to warm water marshes where unfortunately tropical fish that were released there some years ago have been thriving and of course competing with some of our native fish, and as well the trails to the area above the cave and basin to get into the area where the discovery was actually made.

The celebration in Banff will be a whole series of big

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Vollmershausen)

events, and I hope many of you can help us celebrate when you come here. One of the highlights of the year, that I hope all kinds of people will participate in, is our centennial baby contest. I will just leave that out there.

But we hope to have a lot of people out here in costume, and some specific projects, and lots of clean-ups and lots of rehabs in town, hopefully we will get Central Park under control at last. Get the trail system along the river, some of that green belt area within the town under control as well. Improve the gardens a little bit. I am counting on it to be a big year for us, and it certainly and probably will promote tourism to this part of the world. I am viewing that as an opportunity to attract those tourists and brainwash them a little bit about what we are all about.

The national side of the centennial program will be felt here as well. For example, Parks Canada is planning a series of caucuses that are intended to look at the next hundred years I guess, the future process that will culminate in a national assembly here in Banff in the fall of 1985, I think it is September, and I expect maybe some of you here will be participating in that.

The highlight of the year, of course, will be the opening of the cave and basin sometime in June when we hope to have royalty here to help us do that.

So that is a few items about Banff that relate to tourism and recreation. When I was trying to decide which items to talk to you about, I had to narrow it down considerably, given the time. If you have any questions about any of the other specifics, we will be happy to deal with that, and we will let Dave have the final word. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Thank you, Jim, no comment regarding the centennial babies. We will call upon our last speaker, Dave.

MR. MORRISSON: I almost feel like I am the adult

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Morrisson)

of the environment after the previous speakers. When I was asked to arrange for somebody to come here and speak to you about some of the problems it asked a number of questions, and I will try to address them. First of all, how does the local resident of Banff and the business community communicate or work with Parks Canada? Well, up until recently, Banff had an elected body of nine directors called the Banff Community Society, formerly known as the Banff Advisory Council. This body, their previous name Advisory Council, really sums it up, advised Parks Canada about various policies, business licenses, housing requirements, et cetera. The body had been in existence for approximately 50 years, and if you read some of the old newspapers, we are talking about the same problems today that they talked about 50 years ago. And after a great deal of discussion, we decided to disband this board; for one thing, we were not getting the cooperation or answers from Parks Canada, and it was also decided that the needs of the community could be served through one voice, that being the Banff School Board who did have some powers of taxation, unlike the City of Calgary in that they have a greater power to administer some of the municipal functions.

Now it's not necessarily when we say we have problems with Parks Canada we don't want to offend the people sitting here on my left, at least not all of them. They suffer from a problem of confused objectives. We want tourism, we have both to protect and preserve, and then we have got to squeeze the last nickel out of any commercial enterprise in the national parks, which they pretty well succeed in doing. In 1980 they announced the economic land rents for Banff National Park, which serve to increase the land rents in some areas by up to 50 percent. The full impact of that won't be felt until 1990 because there are various proposals and options phasing in where we pay two, four, six, eight percent of the appraised value, so much on your groceries, so much on your rental, and also not all the leases come up at

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Morrisson)

the same time. There are 78 different forms of leases in the park, a lot, so that over the years there is really no consistency in how it was administered. So anyway, Banff faced that problem in 1980, and the impact can be felt as most businesses that chose the phase-in method for rental, it was 10,000, all of a sudden it was 125,000, and it keeps increasing in multiples. So I get back to that in that their mandate alone is protecting and preserving, looking after the parks, and I think Parks do a very good job of looking after and running the park portion of it. They are probably very poor townsite administrators, and they have been charged with this responsibility, and I don't think that we can be too critical, I think they work with what they have to do. But it is very difficult to get answers or movement on things, and Bruce was talking about something that I found kind of interesting.

When we were on Town Council we were looking at future housing requirements, we recommended a site to the north of Bumpers on the way into town. Well the group that requested keep Bow Valley natural to the Minister went to look at this area and see what the environmental impact would be, and the Minister complied. Also within that package there is two motels there currently on the outskirts of town and the proposal was to move them, keep the motels in the commercial sector within a confined area. Well Bruce was tied up in various projects, so the developer who had the land, they just kept saying well wait another couple of months, well two years later the developer goes ahead, and under his lease he can develop and increase his accommodation by 20 percent. So instead of consolidating the base within the townsite, we make a very poor decision, I think, and perhaps Bruce may disagree with me, that having a good service base within the town through waiting for this bureaucratic practice to occur, I think a poor decision was made in terms of environmental impact.

And the other thing that is interesting to see, some of

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Morrisson)

the things changed, ten years ago when we had too many getting run over, Parks Canada went out and blasted 200 away, now we build overpasses. Some of the inconsistencies that we see in philosophy, and that also applies to the administration of the town.

I was asked to say something about tourism, our company is heavily involved with tourism. I serve on numerous boards related to tourism, and one of the things about tourism, I think it is a renewable resource, it is the third largest industry in the Province of Alberta, it employs one out of ten Canadians, and it is one that I think the impact, the social and environmental impact is not that severe. Especially I feel that for foreign visitors, we handle a great deal of Americans, a great deal of Japanese, and generally speaking they are not wandering that far out of the park. They can see the natural beauty, and with a proper interpretive program, I think parks are moving in the right direction in that regard, in teaching people how to appreciate the environment without being destructive.

The year-round occupancy of Banff I think is only about 61 percent, in November, October, it's probably about 15 percent capacity, this is a great deal of surplus capacity. But we spend a great deal of time training our people, our drivers will go through a 22-day training program, part of it in conjunction with Parks, they work with them and their interpretive services. And the biggest thing once we get them through this, how to treat the visitors and what their jobs are, after about six months you have got to retrain them again, because then when somebody throws a cigarette butt on the ground, they tell that guy he's a jerk instead of trying to do it in a polite, rational way, and Parks Canada does the same thing.

But anyway, I think one of the major things in the handling of more tourists in the national park is training people how to handle them. I think we can have increased tourism with negligible environmental impact as long as they

are trained.

Some of you people have probably been to Disneyworld, or Disneyland, I was there two weeks ago for a board meeting, and the grounds were spotless. I had the good fortune to spend some time with the former Chairman of the Board of Disneyworld, and their whole training philosophy is to get the visitor as soon as he arrives into thinking that we keep this place clean. Having little guys with hats on going around sweeping all the time, and pretty soon as you get further into their facility, and you have seen this three or four times, and well-marked waste disposal units, the thought of throwing something on the ground pretty well disappears.

Those of you who have travelled in Japan, in Tokyo, a city of 12 or 13,000,000, you don't see a lot of clutter in the streets. People are regimented or taught, or trained that if everybody threw garbage on the ground, then Tokyo would be four feet higher than it is right now. But the training process is probably the most, or the one that can resolve an increased visitation with the least environmental impact.

I think the planning process also by Parks Canada for townsite administration for years we have been talking should the Town of Banff have autonomy, or what type of self-government should we have, and the problem really goes back to probably it won't be resolved in the next five years or ten years or whatever, how do Parks Canada administer some controls and yet at the same time allow the people to say what is going on, and that's a real problem that is facing us. There is no security in leasehold interests, you have got a land rental structure subject to review every so many years, and Parks Canada have never been able to give us what the bill be to run the town. Until those issues are resolved, the status quo will remain in effect.

I am not as well prepared as these other gentlemen, but if you have any questions, I will be pleased to answer.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Thank you Dave, I'm sure we do have questions. Before I throw the meeting open for your questions, I will ask our speakers if they wish to question one another? I'm rather scared to turn Parks Canada loose on poor David here. I now call for questions from the floor, and I would ask that you identify yourself and your study groups, and keep your questions short, I'm sure we will have quite a lot in the next few minutes. Graham Griffiths.

DR. GRIFFITHS: Graham Griffiths, Pollution Study Group, and I am a little concerned about this emphasis on tourism. Parks were set up to be preserved in perpetuity, and I think that in order to do this tourism should not be maximized. There are certain kinds of tourism which are inconsistent with your preservation mandate, for instance, we do not wish to see massive spectator events where you get tens of thousands of people tramping the area flat, taking place inside national parks, that includes the Olympics and any other kind of mass spectator event. I don't think we need Disneyland, I don't think we should be competing with cities in providing theatre, those should be in Edmonton and Calgary where people can go to the theatre in the winter. When they come to Banff, I think they want to see a natural environment, I don't think we want to compete with Las Vegas and Atlantic City in providing casinos, because maximizing tourism in that kind of way is inconsistent with the preservation mandate. And I think if there is to be any change of Parks policy in those directions, you better get out and hold a new series of public hearings to find out if that is really what people want.

Now, to get to a specific question, I am going to ask one specific one about the new employment program which I understand the Federal Government is going to bring in; will this benefit parks administration, will you get a lot of young people to help you out, and if so, I very much hope that you will also be able to supervise them properly. One of the

problems with the old STEP program was it provided funding for paying students a minimum wage, it provided no funding for paying supervisors, so an awful lot of students were turned loose on projects without being properly qualified to do the work. But perhaps a new program will be better, I wonder if we could ask you for comments of what their plans are for using people if they get a lot of people in the parks?

MR. KUN: I think I should give you a copy of my paper so you don't misunderstand what I said. I didn't suggest that we change the nature of the national parks into places for spectator events. I simply was pointing out that if people are better educated to use the parks, the way they were intended to be used, we will all be happier.

With respect to the youth program, I don't have, or we don't have at the present time the amount of assistance that we may get out of that. Those of you who may have read the Globe and Mail in the last few days and saw the national parks mentioned as being one of the initiatives in Environment 2000, and there is no question, and in fact there will be support, built into the program for supervisors to overlook the crews. There will also be money made available for the establishment of camps where camps are required. We intend in Parks Canada to use the youth people in two general areas, one is to enhance the existing programs we have, the existing visitor service campgrounds, et cetera, and more particularly on trail improvement.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Thank you. David, would you like to answer his question?

MR. MORRISSON: No.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: I now call upon the gentleman on my left.

MR. DUDLEY: George Dudley, Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. I have a couple of questions I would like to present to Dr. Bruce Leeson, and the first one is do you believe that the trailer/camper facilities at Waterton is adequate?

DR. LEESON: Are you referring to the townsite campgrounds?

MR. DUDLEY: Particularly yes, they include the other two, but particularly downtown. I know that many people are a little reluctant to go to Waterton because they are afraid that they won't be able to get a place to camp. And I think if there was more facilities there, there would be more visitor participation.

DR. LEESON: That particular area, the townsite campground is used to its capacity, its physical capacity, there is not an opportunity to expand that at all. About nine or ten years ago there was quite a to-do over us opening a overflow campground in the park at the same time as private enterprise had established what was called a homestead campground within two miles of the entrance of the park, where they said nobody would come to their site as long as we provided for continued overflow camping in the park. So an agreement was made where the campground in Waterton Parks as a whole, when we were full we would not open any overflow campgrounds until they were full. Since that time, Alberta has already established another campground, so while you may not be able to come late in the day and get a camp in the Waterton campground, there are others around. But like anything else, it's a scarce commodity and it's a first come, and those people will get the spots.

MR. DUDLEY: It's a deterrent to many people visiting the park. The second question I have is you mentioned you thought maybe this grizzly bear situation in Waterton Park could get worse, and I was wondering, is there enough precautions being taken to protect the visitors against the grizzly bears, bears generally, but especially grizzlies?

DR. LEESON: In concert with Glacier National Park in Montana, probably one of the most sophisticated bear alert systems in North America is operated there, and to the limit of our technical and manpower ability, we try and inform back

country visitors throughout that whole part of the boundary areas where bears are and to keep them away. Whether more could be done right now with the equipment and people we have got is very questionable. If we have more Parks Canada people out on trails trying to watch where bears are, possibly more can be done.

MR. DUDLEY: I guess the question is whether the parks are for the bears or for the people.

DR. LEESON: Rhetorical question, I hope.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Go now to Cliff Wallis.

MR. WALLIS: Cliff Wallis, and I would like to address this to Steve Kun. If you see greater education and coordination role in the whole tourism, resource protection outside the national parks, what I am getting at, there is areas like Dinosaur which aren't in the national parks system, and there are also other areas of national significance, Cypress Hills that probably aren't getting the attention they deserve, and I'm wondering if you see national parks in their own interpretive program trying to tell people that there are other resources to try and take the pressure off some of the most heavily visited places like Banff; I wonder if you see a role there at all?

MR. KUN: I understand the concept you are promoting, Mr. Wallis, and certainly if we were doing the job well enough already within Parks Canada, I would say yes, let's offer to coordinate better with the provinces and with other agencies to do this kind of thing you are talking about. That is good tourism marketing as well, and what we are looking at more closely at the moment, and as I have said, we have got to get past this threshold before we can entertain what you are talking about, we want to present in the case of the block of four mountain parks, treat them as one entity, as one package so that the message delivered at the east gate in Banff Park, or somewhere in the vicinity of the east gate of Banff Park is for the bundle, and help people match up their expectations with the opportunities in

the various places. This is the same principle that would apply if we got together with the Province of Alberta, and with Travel Alberta particularly, to help redirect people with good information. I support the principle highly, unfortunately I have a strong feeling that we have not yet got our own in-house act together.

MR. WALLIS: Would you see the travel industry themselves developing that as part of their strategy and then applying to the various government departments?

MR. KUN: I think the first initiative of that kind of thing could best come from Travel Alberta. But I would find no problem in helping out and coordinating our efforts along with theirs to that end.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: The gentleman on my left.

MR. SMITH: Alan Smith, with Urban Pollution Study Group. I think Dave and Jim might be the best ones to answer my concerns here, and by the way, we are glad to hear that the water is safe to drink, we saw the note, but it was a little bit too late. I am hoping we can get some action on the air quality in Banff. You can smell Banff about a mile away some nights, and the pollution problems being caused by wood-burning stoves and fireplaces that are becoming quite popular in the town. It is a simplification to say that Banff residents are putting in wood-burning fireplaces while the rest of the world are shutting them down, but it is not too much of a simplification. The British have been working for 27 years to rid their towns and cities of wood-burning appliances, and I guess even in the U.S. they sort of started cleaning up their wood-burning problems by the time Banff residents started putting them in. And everybody seems so surprised by the fact that wood-burning appliances are the most dangerous sources of air pollution, much more dangerous than industry. I picked up an elementary school book in the library, and sure enough, anybody that has read an elementary school book or graduated from elementary school should be aware that they are a major environmental problem.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Question Period)

I flew to London, England and they said oh yes, they are a major problem, and the Canadian ones are about 30 times dirtier than the ones we have shut down in Britain.

You have talked quite a bit about the environment, I would say the most important environmental problem in any town, let alone one in the national parks, being ignored by the group, I don't know, Jim, if you had a chance to check with the U.S., they talk about special measures for their national parks to prevent what happened in Vale, Aspen, Steamboat Springs, and one magazine article actually mentions Banff and Jasper, so I guess American visitors noted that the town smells a bit, something the residents don't seem to notice.

MR. VOLLMERSHAUSEN: Yes, that is not wood-burning stoves, they are wood-burning buses. You must be right, I live here, I don't smell it. But no, we have actually only recently become exposed more and more to the literature on the subject you are talking about, I'm not aware at the moment of, you know, the water side, sewage side, we are confronted with standards and so on, put out by various other federal or provincial governments, and I fully expect that before very long, and probably rightly so, we will be faced with those same kind of emission standards to deal with wood-burning stoves and so on. And without doubt, we will have to deal with that forthrightly when that happens. I'm not aware at the moment truthfully of a standard that I could apply in Banff that would give me advice and direction on whether or not another wood-burning stove, or whether or not fireplaces would continue, or what about our picnic sites and so on.

MR. SMITH: So many countries have them, Jim, I could give you half a dozen.

MR. VOLLMERSHAUSEN: My problem, of course, would be the first time I tried to enforce some other country's standards, I would be told what to do with it, especially with some of the wood-burning buses.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: The gentleman on my right.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT
(Question Period)

DR. HACKLER: Jim Hackler, the Science Advisory Committee, and I'd like to address Mr. Vollmershausen, or any of you I'm sure are aware of the dilemma, in the back country how does one get a balance between experienced hikers and those that aren't? I think it is illustrated by my first trip into the Egypt Lake area, we camped at a small lake, and we think we left no trace behind when we went out of the area. At a later trip then the policy to concentrate people in certain areas, we camped at a shelter that was then built at the Egypt Lakes area, and witnessed one of the groups among the dozen or so people in the shelter seeing how fast they could drink their five bottles of scotch they had brought in, seeing how fast they could burn up the wood that the helicopter had brought in and how far they could urinate from the front door, having contests late into the evening. It just seems like the whole policy at that time of concentrating people in certain areas so you wouldn't ruin the back country really worked against people who did know how to camp. I know that's a dilemma, you have got more people using these areas, have you ever thought of licensing these people the way we do for driving cars. If you don't know how to use them, you aren't allowed to use them. So you have people who could camp in dispersed areas at high altitude lakes, and use that terrain, I'm sure you could accommodate quite a few people if they did take care of the terrain. But this concentration of people seems to put the drunks and the people that -- there were four dogs without leashes running about that area, and it struck me that the concentration of people worked to the disadvantage of the area rather than to the advantage. I don't know exactly how you deal with this dilemma, but I would like some of your comments.

MR. MORRISSON: I think you should close the back country and just put everybody on buses, myself.

MR. VOLLMERSHAUSEN: You are absolutely right about the problem associated with that kind of facility. The facility itself, because of what you are talking about is in need of repair as well, but Steve mentioned something when he was

talking about the education of people who are going to use the back country, or cross-country skiing, or whatever it may be, whether we call it skill development or whatever. And that is an area that has been touched somewhat as well in Banff you can buy cross-country skis, the seller of same will provide some instruction, and where we are interested in expanding on that process in all fields, whether it's skiing, or hiking, or climbing or whatever it might be, dealing with The Association of Mountain Guides for example in that area. So that's one avenue we are taking to deal with the problem we are talking about, a skill development kind of education program. This business of concentration of people in one spot is a, well you said it, it's a dilemma. There are advantages to doing that, the disadvantage becomes apparent because that kind of group they are especially in large enough numbers take over the facilities, and that happens from time to time.

I was up in the same area in July, and that particular problem wasn't apparent. The question of people being properly ready for the experience they were going to be confronted with, the question of having gone over the paths and going through the wet meadows, and Steve, you were along that day too, and hikers coming up with running shoes on, Bermuda shorts and so on, it just wasn't a day for that. I was feeling sorry for what they were going to be like when they got to the top. It's an education issue, it's an awareness issue, and short of permits or a licensing system, I think that's probably where we're going to have to concentrate our efforts. We are not into a lot more of those kinds of shelters though, we have been asking ourselves a question about I guess, you get a 20-unit campground at the edge of the lake or near a lake somewhere, how does that work versus say a slope type of situation. The mountain parks project will be talking about that at some length, that whole question you have raised we will be talking about during that process as well, and I'm sure we will be getting

lots of views.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: We have approximately five minutes left for the next four questions. The gentleman on my left.

DR. WOOD: I will try to be brief, my name is Charlie Wood, Renewable Resources Study Group. I was listening to all the speakers and not one brought up an issue that has concerned me for quite a while. I have been coming here for about half the length of the park I realized now, and when I first came here as a young person I used to look at the trees and say that's nice, they'll be here forever. And as I acquired the technical education and met people with different technical backgrounds, I became aware of some of the problems, the trees won't be there forever. This is a manmade problem, the way nature handled it was with a fire followed by grasses, followed by small trees, followed by mature trees, followed by another fire. Man comes along and suppresses the fire, and then the normal way of getting around that is if you allow loggers in, and then the park suppresses loggers. So when you know people like this Crossley who is an old-time forester and far from being an admirer of the way forestry is handled in the national parks, you begin to think about some of these problems. They continually tell you that the over-mature spruce are an absolute bucket of gasoline waiting for someone to light them, and they are a reservoir of disease and everything else. So really this is a problem that has nothing to do with people, animal interactions with people or park wardens, this is probably entirely created by the park management, and it is a problem which very few people are aware of. I just wondered if some of you gentlemen would care to address this issue?

DR. LEESON: You are exactly right with everything you said, possibly Parks Canada's very effective application of Smokey the Bear objectives has had the greatest environmental impact on this and other Rocky Mountain parks of anything that has ever happened here. We know this, in recent years we have new employees who are receiving training

with regard to fire management, and this past year, within the past two months an experimental fire was started close to Banff out near Lake Minnewanka, and we are learning skills to be able to use management as a proper environmental management tool, to use fire that is, and I expect one of the interesting tourist things in the years to come will be come to Banff forest fire 1988, or something like that.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Gentleman on my right.

MR. FAUSER: Horst Fauser, Non-Renewable Resources, and I would like to ask Dr. Leeson how in the parks we do manage wildlife populations in their relationship to the actual available habitat?

DR. LEESON: It's different in all of the parks, Elk Island is probably the best example where there are too many animals for the habitat to sustain them, and we are engaged in population reduction programs. We literally go out and remove them, we have to shoot the moose, we can't round them up, we round up elk and make them available to the province.

MR. FAUSER: Could these programs also transfer to other areas, like Waterton Parks, do you also have some problems with elk, like transplanted?

DR. LEESON: We have not attempted to capture elk in Waterton Park, that is a most curious herd, it's an international herd because it summers in the United States and spends the fall and spring in Waterton Park, and the winter in the Province of Alberta. Their hunting season is extended into January on the eastern boundaries in Waterton Park to try and harvest surplus elk, and also last year the Province of Alberta attempted to capture elk south of the Bow River, it was thought last year there were between 13,000 and 18,000 elk in the foothills of Alberta, south of the Bow River, and the Province of Alberta Fish and Wildlife Division set up a large capture program and they were attempting to transplant some of the elk to the northern part of the province. After a terrific effort and a lot of people

and a lot of expenditure, the day they were just about within a few minutes of capturing a large number of elk, a pick-up boat of native people tore into the place and started shooting, and the whole thing was over, their whole effort was lost.

MR. FAUSER: I didn't like your figure, I think 1300 elk would be more appropriate, there are not 13,000 elk in that area.

DR. LEESON: Oh yes, sir, there are.

MR. FAUSER: Not according to Fish and Wildlife.

DR. LEESON: Last week I would have seen at least 800 all by myself in one valley.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Before you go, Bruce, I would like to ask you to comment on the native predators program, are you trying to assist the wardens to increase, this is something you haven't spoken of?

DR. LEESON: We are not actively engaged in predator expansion or control of anything. The wolves are probably expanding, more and more have been seen in Banff Park than have been in many years. We stopped shooting predators early in the mid-1960's, and don't control them anymore.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Guy Swinnerton.

DR. SWINNERTON: Guy Swinnerton, Chairman of the Environment Protection Study Group. My question I think is probably most appropriately to Steve Kun, relating to the comments he made with regard to appropriate activities within parks, and I think the comment I am going to make applies not only to national parks, but also provincial parks. I think that one of the dangers that many people see as our management skills develop within parks, both dealing with the resource base and also management of people, that we can legitimize in a very real way through technical documents and so forth the fact that we have so many activities both recreational and non-recreational in origin. And I think the problem that we might foresee, even if we are not seeing it

now, is the fact that by arguing purely on a technical standpoint you can legitimize these activities, yet at the same time become more distantly removed from perhaps the philosophical base for the rationale for parks, and perhaps the image the park has both in terms of the agency and more particularly the public in general, and I wondered if Steve could address that conflict between our technical capabilities and the philosophical base that we want parks to portray?

MR. KUN: I think that technology and knowledge is our salvation in continuing to be able to pursue that basic philosophy on which our preservation aspect of parks is based. The internal use of the parks themselves is really not our problem of the future, it is what is coming in from the outside, and that is another issue that we should debate sometime. To do things well inside is something that has to be addressed, looking at philosophy first, but knowledge and technology second. I would like to just illustrate something to you that I think is a sterling example of using technology or good sense to preserve the base. Olympic National Park, U.S., in the early '60's, the trail going up from the parking lot up towards the glaciers was a trail that was just a quagmire, it rains a lot there. The U.S. Parks people said "Good grief, we've got to reduce the size of the parking lot because there are too many people coming here that are trampling this place to death." I had the fortune of going back some years later, and I noticed that they had doubled the size of the parking lot. I thought, what happened here, somebody got the one half and two mixed up. But as I got out of my car and started walking up the trail I realized what had happened. What had been a 20 to 30-foot wide trail on my previous visit was now about a 12-foot wide asphalt trail. Everybody was walking on the asphalt, the shoulders of that trail had been rehabilitated with natural vegetation, and they were putting two times the number of people over that trail than had gone over that trail in the first instance.

To me, if that is the application of technology in the interest of preservation, I think it was a good move.

CHAIRWOMAN BROADBENT: Thank you. That winds up our morning program, I believe refreshments are available. Thank you for being an attentive audience.

(REFRESHMENT BREAK)

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to call the session to order, we are already eight minutes overtime due to the last session going over. I am your Chairman for this session, and the Resolutions Committee Chairman, my name is Bob Richardson, for those who don't know. I would like to introduce two of the other three members of the Resolution Committee, first of all our Vice-Chairperson, Dr. Sheri Dalton, and Mr. Norm Carlson. The other member, unfortunately, could not make the meeting, but I would like to thank them all for their help. Elsie Friesen is the fourth member of our committee, and I think they have done an excellent job, and have certainly given me a lot of support.

I would also like to thank Dave Buchwald and the members of the ECA Research Staff for their comments on the Resolutions. I don't know whether Dave is here right now or not, but at any rate, I would like to assure him that I have reviewed each of their comments, and I have incorporated them into the resolutions whenever possible under the committee's present mandate which does not allow us to change the intent of the resolution. So if some other comments are not in the resolutions, that is why, because we can not change the content.

Going on from there, at a recent meeting of the Coordinating Committee, it was decided to change the mandate of the Resolutions Committee for 1984. The committee decided that now in future, or at least for 1984, all resolutions will be submitted by the study group Chairman direct to the Resolutions Committee before going to the Coordinating Committee. The resolutions committee now has a mandate to comment on the contents as well as the form and

wording of the resolution, and they have been given the power to send a resolution back to the study group if they don't feel it has been worked on sufficiently, or it is not appropriate at the present time.

The Resolution Committee will also be responsible for the liaison with Dave Buchwald and his research group, of course through Bill Flook, and we would like to get resolutions at the earliest possible date so that we will give Dave and his group a chance to comment on them, hopefully the Science Advisory Committee as well; and once we get these together, the Resolutions Committee would send back the amended resolution, or if necessary, to the study group chairman that originated it, and it would then be approved by their study group, come back to the Resolutions Committee and go out to the Coordinating Committee.

The Coordinating Committee also has decided that it is much better to have a few good resolutions, timely ones, than to have a great number of possibly weak resolutions, and therefore, in future, the Coordinating Committee, when they get the resolutions from the Resolution Committee will priortize them and decide which ones should go forth in that year. You may also get from the Resolutions Committee the suggestion that you do not push your resolution, but rather use one of the other forms that P.A.C. has of getting their concerns across, and that is of course to write direct to the Minister by either the study group chairman or the P.A.C. Committee Chairman; write a letter direct to the Minister, and in that way if it is a resolution you would like to go through sooner, it is going to get there a lot faster because the resolutions don't get there until after the next annual meeting. It is not always the best way to do it, resolutions do carry more force, but in some cases, a letter is a good way to do it.

Now, to the important business of considering the 1983 resolutions. You all were sent them in your packet, and should have had a chance to look them over and get your

comments. I want to just remind you that we will accept no new resolutions from the floor. On the resolutions we have here, I hope that everyone will feel free to comment on them as we discuss, and this includes of course all the ECA staff, any visitors and any members of the public. You have the right to comment on any resolution, however, only members of P.A.C. can vote on them.

If you have concerns about any resolutions, please speak out because high quality resolutions are a measure of P.A.C.'s viability, and their activities, and it is essential that all resolutions are important, viable and valid. Resolutions are all that many government departments ever hear about P.A.C. or see from P.A.C., and we are judged very often on the quality of our resolutions, and the quality of the answers are very often dependent on the quality of our resolutions as well.

As in the past, I will read the title of each resolution, and then request the chairman of the study group who voted the resolution to go to one of the mikes and move the resolution. I will then ask for a seconder, and then I will ask the mover of the resolution to speak first to the resolution if they wish, or if not, to remain close to the mike so that they can answer any questions that are asked. To make the task of our reporting staff easier, please give your name when seconding a resolution, or commenting on a resolution. And if you wish to make an amendment to a resolution, please speak slowly while you are making the amendment so that our good staff here can get it down exactly as you wish it.

The first one is Resolution 1, it was submitted by the Education Advisory Committee, and I would ask Dr. Julian Guay to move that resolution entitled "Government grant support for leadership and environmental educational programs". Is Dr. Guay here? We will put this resolution back until he is here, and we will go to Resolution 2 by the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. They have two resolutions, Resolution 2

is "Research into lining of irrigation ditches".

MRS. HUNTER: I will move this resolution -- I am sorry, Betty Hunter, Non-Renewable Resources, I will move this resolution.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you, do we have a seconder from the group? Horst Fauser.

RESOLUTION 2 MOVED BY MRS. BETTY HUNTER, SECONDED BY HORST FAUSER.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Do you wish to speak to the resolution?

MRS. HUNTER: Not at this time, but I will entertain any questions.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any comments or questions to the resolution? All right, I will call the question, all in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary, if any?

(NONE)

(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED AS WRITTEN)

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Resolution 3, "Recycling of lubricating oils".

MRS. HUNTER: I will move this resolution.

RESOLUTION 3 MOVED BY MRS. BETTY HUNTER, SECONDED BY DOUGLAS HORRIE.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any comments or questions on this resolution? Everybody must be hungry, no one is commenting. I will call the question then, all in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary, if any?

(ONE)

(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED)

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: We will move to Resolution 4, this

is a Pollution Study Group Resolution, and since this resolution was sent out to you it has been rethought, and when Lub moves the resolution, it won't read exactly as it does here, but all you have to do is cross out about four words, so I will ask you to do that on your copy as Lub reads it.

DR. WOJTIW: I would like to move the following resolution: THAT the Lieutenant-Governor in Council direct the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public hearings on water management in Alberta. You can see what we are doing is throwing out the words "water resources commission" and the word "jointly".

RESOLUTION 4 MOVED BY LUB WOJTIW, SECONDED BY MARTHA KOSTUCH.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any comments? Would you come to one of the microphones, please?

MRS. KRABBE: I'm Jenny Krabbe with the Environment Protection Study Group, and I'm not sure of the process here, so I will just ask you if it is possible within the terms of reference also to consider water quantity licensing?

DR. KOSTUCH: It is included under the terms of reference, it is suggested that they include a review of the legislation standard of enforcement related to the management of water quality and water quantity, and our intention was water quantity as well.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Does that answer your question, Jenny? It is in the last paragraph, the third line. Are there any other questions? I will call the question, all those in favor of the resolution as read?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary, if any?

(NONE)

(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED AS MOVED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE POLLUTION STUDY GROUP)

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: We will move on to Resolution 5, and it is also by the Pollution Study Group entitled "The impacts of pollution on heath."

DR. WOJTIW: I would like to move this resolution.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Would you like to just read it, Lub, and make sure we understand it?

DR. WOJTIW: THAT the Government of Alberta establish methods and procedures of dealing with the impacts of pollution on health in Alberta communities.

RESOLUTION 5 MOVED BY LUB WOJTIW, SECONDED BY BILL IRWIN.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any comments or questions for Lub?

DR. NORRIE: Douglas Norrie, Non-Renewable Group. Like everybody here, I support the intent of this motion, but it's broad in its direction, I would have predicted its much more likelihood of success if it had been framed in the manner of the preceding motion, namely that an existing mechanism of the Environment Council be directed to hold public hearings on this very important issue. It is presumably too late to make that kind of change, but at the very least I would like to ask if the group putting forward this motion had considered that, it is mentioned as a possibility within this motion.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Well, if you feel strongly enough about it, it can be brought as an amendment to the motion, but I would like to let Lub comment on it.

DR. WOJTIW: The only comment that I have, and in fact, that part is included in the background where it says "a full and complete study by the Environment Council of Alberta, including public hearings", other than that, it is not included in the resolution.

DR. MAHAFFY: Peter Mahaffy, S.A.C. I share the same concern with the generality of the resolution, and I am wondering if it requests any action that is specific enough

to accomplish anything, and particularly if there is a suggestion that public hearings might be held, I wonder if possible terms of reference to those public hearings could be specified as they were in the last resolution.

DR. WOJTIW: Can we get a deferral of this resolution and we will bring an amendment in the next session?

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Yes, if you wish to make the motion to have it deferred, we will do that?

DR. WOJTIW: I so move.

DR. KOSTUCH: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: All in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Any contrary?

(NONE)

Okay, we will defer this motion and use it as Number 1 on Resolution Session 2.

We will go then to the resolutions put forward by the Renewable Resources Study Group, and I'm not sure which one it is, you should have a revised copy in front of you, and when they were handing them out they didn't give us one -- Randy will have some there.

Resolution 6 is "Hazardous waste management", and the study group wish to change their motion, you have the revised one in front of you, and Charlie will read it to you when he moves the motion.

DR. WOOD: I would like to move this motion as written on the amendment paper in front of you. This amendment, I believe, follows the document or whatever, but it doesn't change the intent of the motion. The whole thing was rewritten for clarification.

RESOLUTION 6 MOVED BY CHARLIE WOOD, SECONDED BY RON WHISTANCE-SMITH.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Okay, it was just written for clarification and there is no change in the intent.

DR. WOOD: Well the background has been expanded, after Kim Sanderson saw this thing, she felt the way it was written originally to actively pursue it, well doing anything can be actively pursuing it, and this was Kim's argument, and this is related to our other two motions, I don't know whether you wish me to discuss them, or maybe we should just let it go the way it is, and it does not need any further discussion.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Maybe we should have comments on this resolution as it stands. Graham?

DR. GRIFFITHS: One minor comment on the background note, I request naming the company which is allegedly has a record of environmentally related violations and convictions for those of us with poor memories, and future readers of the resolution, could it be named, please?

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: In the background, I presume it could.

DR. WOOD: I'm sorry, you wanted the company, it is named, Graham.

DR. GRIFFITHS: It has been taken off again.

DR. WOOD: Oh, I'm sorry, I don't know who it is, perhaps it could be, we could probably get a hold of that. Presumably this is the sort of thing that could be put in as an editorial thing when I get back to Edmonton, if you wish.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Yes, perhaps you get that name, we would want to be sure that it was correct though, otherwise it is much better to leave it out rather than put an incorrect one in. With all the machinations that go on with corporate takeovers and so on, we want to make sure that we have the right company. So perhaps, Charlie, if you have a good source you could get this from?

DR. WOOD: I am sure I can find out.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: If you would then get that to Randy, I don't think the group would have any objection to that. Any other comments on the resolution as it is here? I will call the question, all those in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary, if any?

(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED)

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Now while Charlie is there, I will ask to speak to Resolution 7, the "Joint site for Edmonton municipal and Alberta hazardous waste processing facility."

DR. WOOD: I would like to move the adoption of Resolution 7.

RESOLUTION 7 MOVED BY CHARLIE WOOD, SECONDED BY RON WHISTANCE-SMITH.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any comments on this?

DR. WOOD: Perhaps I should briefly comment on this, recently I met a gentleman who is Chairman of the Strathcona Industrial Association, he is a recently retired manager of the Gulf Refinery, and has considerable interest and technical concern, ability, whatever, in this area, and he likes this idea considerably. He says over and over again that anything is better than trucking this stuff to Swan Hills, and this and the other one pleases him considerably, which was quite a heartening experience for us, it looks like we hit on one that they are going to have some sympathy with.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any comments?

DR. BUCKMASTER: Harvey Buckmaster from S.A.C. I wonder where the energy from the incinerator will go to?

DR. WOOD: You mean the idea of exchanging energy between the facilities, is that what you are talking about?

DR. BUCKMASTER: What I mean is that the incinerator process is ideally suited to the development of some electrical and steam generating plant, and I would be very concerned if it was just put up in the air, which is what usually happens, so I would like to see some mention of that in it, because I think it is an integrated facility, and it is particularly appropriate, and the government's policy on energy generation is to actively discourage such activities.

The City of Calgary wanted to take the heat from their sewage plant and generate about a megawatt of electricity, and they were told that the City should stay out of the generating business, and that is why I am concerned about the implications of this.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Do you have a comment, Charlie?

DR. WOOD: Well, this is dealt with in Part 5 of the background. The idea that hopefully some of the energy could be utilized within the industrial community, we realize the resistance on the part of the major producers, but we understand that there is considerable amount of browbeating goes on, and that this concept of them accepting energy produced by small producers is perhaps gaining some credibility.

DR. BUCKMASTER: I guess my concern is how could we strengthen the motion to make it clear that we felt strongly about that aspect of the matter, and I'm just trying to see how we might get a foothold on that particular issue since it's really appropriate to where Charlie has some comments to incorporate into the actual motion.

MR. FLOOK: Bill Flook, Director of Liaison, E.C.A. When this resolution was in the early stages of discussion, it was one of a group of three resolutions directed to different aspects of disposal of both hazardous and conventional wastes in Alberta; one being a city problem, the disposal of conventional wastes; and the other a provincial problem, the disposal of hazardous or special wastes. Eventually, because of exactly the type of thing that Dr. Buckmaster just outlined, it was decided to concentrate purely and simply on the one resolution which brought the disposal of special wastes and the disposal of normal combustible municipal wastes together in one site, and at the same time, differentiate between the function involved in the disposal of special wastes that involve combustion, and the function in the disposal of special wastes that involved landfilling. These were the two aspects

that we thought, or the committee thought important enough to want a resolution, and this resolution is confined to that alone. The other aspects that were mentioned by Dr. Buckmaster were discussed and they were reported, they were the subject of other resolutions that have not yet come forward.

DR. WOOD: Just one interesting little comment on this thing, there must be some merit to this idea because several people are claiming credit for it. We don't claim credit for it, but we thought we got it from Alderman Wright in Edmonton, or part of the idea anyway, but in discussing it with other people, I have had others claim it.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any other comments? Graham?

DR. GRIFFITHS: There would be very considerable difficulty in finding a site in or near Edmonton, if near means within a few kilometers. It is just political death to advocate giving land to Edmonton for the purpose of even putting in normal municipal garbage anywhere in the County of Strathcona. From my looking at this resolution, I see what a benefit would be if a site could be found close to the city, at the same time I can see endless wrangling and no site being found if the government intends to implement this. I am therefore led to wonder if the resolution would serve any useful purpose and whether this resolution should be left alone and let the government decide and tell us where, let the government decide where they want to put the plant, and whether we want to put a specific resolution now at this time, if they pursue this, what would happen is we would have another couple of years of hearings and we won't get any plant.

DR. WOOD: Perhaps I can comment on this, the Chairman of the Strathcona Industrial Association is not alone in supporting this idea. He apparently, he tells me that their association meets quite frequently, and it represents all the industrial producers in the Strathcona area. And he maintains that they are very, very adamant

about the idea of not wanting to truck their material, and that since a good part of it is generated in that area, that they are quite prepared to support this idea, and the other thing that has happened is that this individual is on a first name basis with several of the Ministers, Deputy Ministers in the Department of Environment, and is lobbying them, so there is considerable interest in this thing.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any other comments? Graham?

DR. GRIFFITHS: Well only that they had endless furor over locating a rendering plant near Sherwood Park. If you try and locate a reactor, I guess you will go through the same thing, a couple of years of hearings and opposition from Sherwood Park, that is my fear.

DR. WOOD: People will tell you repeatedly that anything that is operated poorly is hazardous, you have to get around the public perception of this thing. There is nothing in the world that can be more dangerous than a refinery if it is not operated properly.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any other comments?

If not, I will call the question. All those in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary?

(ONE)

I guess the rest are abstaining, I declare the resolution carried.

We skipped Resolution 1 because Dr. Guay was not here to move it, so I will ask Dr. Guay, the Chairman of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee, to move Resolution 1, which is "Government grant support for leadership and environmental education programs".

DR. GUAY: I would like to move Resolution 1. This was a resolution brought by Erich Berndt and our committee, and basically the idea was that we were very concerned about the cutbacks in various areas of government, and we didn't want it to affect encouraging conferences and

publications and so forth. And another factor we are concerned with is that inflation has increased the cost of this, so we formally want to see the funds not reduced, in fact we want to see some increases, and that was the reason behind it.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Could I have a seconder for the resolution?

RESOLUTION 1 MOVED BY JULIAN GUAY, SECONDED BY ERICH BERNDT.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any questions or comments? Chris?

MR. DUNKLEY: Chris Dunkley with Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. I wish to move a motion amendment, amending the motion to this motion, by moving that the words "or expand" be eliminated in the wording of the motion. If I get a seconder for that, I wish to speak to that.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Where is this now, Chris?

MR. DUNKLEY: Just eliminating the words "or expand" in the first sentence.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Is there a seconder for that motion? Gordon Cameron.

AMENDING MOTION TO RESOLUTION 1 MOVED BY CHRIS DUNKLEY, SECONDED BY GORDON CAMERON.

MR. DUNKLEY: Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Province of Alberta in their economic downturn and concern about the credibility of this group by sending in a resolution that just is not appropriate at this time in the economic climate. As far as I am concerned, I would favor government entrenchment firmly, or even the reducing, but not in any way increasing. So I don't feel we are helping ourselves by even suggesting an increase, and that is the way I feel about it.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any other comments?

MR. BERNDT: Erich Berndt, Environment Education Advisory Committee, and Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk against the amendment. Basically, Mr. Chairman, I believe that in this province when this government can squander money on sand at Kananaskis Country golf courses and many other areas, that the least they can do is provide money for educational purposes, both in the non sort of what we call formal sense as we are advocating in this resolution. And the amount of money that we are talking about is very minimal but costs have gone up for our public groups, anywhere from postage in the last several years, and they will continue to rise, paper costs, printing costs, et cetera. I am urging you to defeat this amendment.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any other comments?

MS. HEDENSTROM: I would like to agree, I speak against the amendment, I think the point is to redirect the thrust of our government, the money is there, it just depends which area they wish to use it. I think we need the educational thrust so badly I think we have to encourage our government to divert the funds they are using in other areas, or at least divert their attention or the thrust of their attention to an educational area.

MR. WHISTANCE-SMITH: Ron Whistance-Smith, Renewable Resources Study Group. I too would like to speak against the amendment, it is a very innocent couple of words, and I think the presently ongoing hearings into the maintenance and expansion of agricultural land base, much of which has happened at public expense, would also have to be cancelled. I don't see anything wrong with maintaining or expanding, again we are talking about a very small sum of money.

DR. GUAY: I would like to agree with what Erich said earlier, but there is one other point here, we are trying to encourage other groups, that is other voluntary groups out there. And I think anything we can do in the public advisory committees to encourage other groups out there and help do the same kind of job we're doing, and I think any money that goes towards this is well spent.

DR. SWINNERTON: Guy Swinnerton, Environment Protection Study Group. I have some element of sympathy with what Chris was saying in the sense I think we have to remember on occasion that many of our groups certainly benefit more than some of our sister groups in other provinces. And in that regard, I have some element of sympathy in terms of saying maintaining it. On the other hand, I think the comments made by other members at this microphone are certainly relevant in terms of the relative thrust of expenditure in the province, in that regard money can be redirected and enhanced within the educational areas. I am making that comment just as an observation of the fact that we shouldn't forget that we do have certain preferred funding relative to some of our colleagues in other provinces, and on the other hand relative to total provincial expenditures, I can certainly see the need for giving the environmental education program greater incentive.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any other comments? Ken?

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, Ken Nelson. People have been speaking to the need to redirect money, possibly the difficulty here is the word expand, perhaps the term you are really looking for is to redirect. I just make that as a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Any other comments? All right, I will call the question on the amendment which was proposed by Chris Dunkley and seconded by Gordon Cameron. Maybe Sheri would be good enough to read the amendment.

DR. DALTON: The amended version was to delete the words "or expand". The motion then becomes: THAT government maintain grants which support those efforts of citizen groups that (1) inform the public about environmental issues and concerns, and (2) provide leadership development in the areas of environmental education and/or citizen participation in environmental decision making.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you, Sheri. All those in favor

of the amendment?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
Contrary?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
(I DECLARE THE AMENDMENT DEFEATED)
CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Are there any other comments before I call the question on the motion? All those in favor of the resolution as originally written?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
Contrary, if any?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.)
CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Now we have gone from Resolution 7 to Resolution 1, and now we only have Resolution 8 to do, plus a resolution tomorrow. We are down to about eight minutes, I don't know whether we should go on with this resolution or break for lunch. Do you want to get it done? Okay, I will ask Marcelle Lutz to move the Resolution 8 put forward by the Urban Environment Study Group, and entitled "Quiet Communities Directorate".
MRS. SLOAN: Jean Sloan, Mr. Chairman, in deference to the fact that Marcelle Lutz could not arrive, I am spokesman for the Urban Environment Group, and I would like to propose this resolution.
CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Do you have a seconder?
MRS. KLUTE: Lorna Klute, I second the motion.

RESOLUTION 8 MOVED BY JEAN SLOAN, SECONDED BY LORNA KLUTE.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Would you like to make any comments to the resolution?
MRS. SLOAN: I think it is self-explanatory.
CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Do I have any other comments by anyone else, or questions on the resolution? If not, I will call the question. All those in favor?
(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary, if any?
(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED)
CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: The only one left then is one that I deferred to the beginning of Session Two which takes place tomorrow, and we also have another item to discuss there which is shown on your agenda. I would like to, while I'm just on this, just take a minute to thank the study groups for the work they have put into these resolutions. I don't think we had to send more than maybe one or two back for a little clarification. There is evidence that a lot more work is being put into these before they are sent in, and I hope that you will continue to do this in the future, because it sure makes the Resolutions Committee's job an awful lot easier.

Thank you very much, we now go to lunch in the Blue Room.
(LUNCHEON ADJOURNMENT)
CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: I would like to welcome you to this afternoon's session, and we are going to look at some of the potential ways of solving some of the problems that have been pointed out so far. The first of our sessions this afternoon deals with the planning stages, and I assume some of the problems with planning for the handling of present requirements on parks and recreation areas, we're trying to get a picture for the need for the future and with planning for the future.

We have three speakers with us this afternoon, all of them eminently qualified to discuss the topics and handle your questions. We have Mr. Barry Rogers, Mr. Bill Shaw and Ms. Jan Bloomfield, and two of them are fellow alumni from Western, so I would like to point that out and get a cheer for Western while we are at it.

Mr. Rogers comes to us from the Alberta Forest Service, he is presently head of the Forest Recreation Program. He has degrees from the Department of Physical Education at the University of Western Ontario, and from the Departments of Parks and Recreation, Administration and Management of the

University of Illinois. He has been involved with both Ontario and Alberta Provincial Parks, from 1976 to 1979 he was a parks master planner with Alberta Provincial Parks.

Mr. Shaw is a member of the Canadian Institute of Planners, he is active in the Alberta Association. He is a member of the Canadian Association of Geographers, and also a member of the City of Red Deer Recreation Board. He has a geography degree with the University of Victoria and the University of Alberta, and he has had a lot of experience with some major projects in Alberta, for example, the Eastern Slopes and the Red Deer River flow regulations. He is now the senior planner and manager of the Regional Planning and Research Section of the Red Deer Planning Commission.

Ms. Bloomfield is also a geographer and an alumnus of the University of Western Ontario. She got her Masters degree from the University of Ottawa, and the topic of her thesis is relevant to Alberta, it was entitled "Recreational Aspects of Public Shoreland and the Administration of Provincial Crown Lands in Alberta." She is now planning manager with Travel Alberta, after serving them as Planning Coordinator in the Tourism Destination area planning program. She has also been active as a research officer with the Outdoor Recreation Open Space Division of the Lands Directorate of Environment Canada, working out of Ottawa.

I would like to welcome you, and I would like to encourage you to welcome them to our session this afternoon. Our first speaker will be Mr. Barry Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Thank you for the introduction. I would like to thank you on behalf of the Forest Service for inviting me to participate in your annual meeting. Interesting situation sitting out there listening to a number of speakers, it is interesting to listen to other speakers and you have to get up later in the day and you have to be one of the speakers. You really kind of assess formal presentations, and it's rather interesting. Formal

presentations usually only give you the information the speaker wants to give you. I am kind of interested in what you as listeners would like to know from myself and the others about recreation. So as a result, my presentation is going to be rather short, as I am very interested in getting into the question period and finding out what you people want to know, rather than me just telling you what I prefer to tell you. I also have rather a personal objective in taking this approach that the Forest Service hasn't really been all that involved in dealing with public user groups or public participation. It's a rather new era for the Forest Service to embark on dealing with people. We are so familiar with dealing with trees that don't talk back, it's kind of interesting.

So I guess I am kind of running a bit of a one-man public participation program this weekend, but don't confuse me with Mr. Harle.

The Forest Service perhaps is one of the oldest government agencies in Alberta. We have been around for some 50 odd years, which really isn't a very long time, we are not that old, there are probably people here older than 50 years old. However, we are rather old in Alberta relative to other agencies that manage natural resources in the province. I guess you could say we are kind of one of the archaic dinosaurs in terms of an agency.

We have basic characteristics that we sort of historically display. We have been rather multi-use oriented in our thinking, rather than single use. So automatically when you think of parks and Forest Service, there is some inconsistency there. Park entities are usually regarded as single use areas set aside for one particular use. Our fundamental thinking is more broader multi-use concepts.

I guess too if you look at that term multi-use, it's kind of out of vogue and the current jargon is integrated use, and I would agree that there has been more than just a jargon change, there is a very distinct difference between multi-use. I think that is the buzz word of the '60's, and integrated

use, or integrated management, the buzz word of the '80's. I think this new jargon reflects perhaps growth, progressiveness and advancement of man's attitude towards his environment. Man I mean collectively as the public, government managing agencies, sort of people generally are pretty concerned about what goes on out there. I think Mr. Cline last night in his talk, we were talking about, somebody asked me a question about why we haven't had a great amount of public participation in Alberta, and he sort of hummed and hawed and thought a bit, and he finally sort of reflected back and said well Jesus, you know, in our training we are told that we know the right answers so why should we go and ask anybody. We all recognize that we don't know those answers, and that it is very important that we talk to the public.

A second philosophy that has made up our character is that we are conservation oriented rather than preservation oriented. Again that is an inconsistency when you deal with parks and recreation areas, wilderness and wild land, ecological reserves, what-have-you. Conservation is defined as wise use, and while wisdom can come from the Bible, in our business it comes from experience and foresight. Wisdom comes from making mistakes, but saying hey, we have learned something from this mistake and let's not do it again. Let's hope that becoming wise in the management of natural resources is done through small resource management areas and incorrect decisions not large ones. I think we can also learn an awful lot, not only across the country, but on a much broader scale around the world, at other resource management decisions. We are always being told that the U.S. is 20 or 30 years ahead of Canada, so let's hope we can look there and see a lot of their problems and a lot of their issues, and catch some of the mistakes before we make the same.

There always seems to be a natural tendency, or a natural mentality that we always have to go and remake the wheel ourselves. I think it is important that we come out of our shell and look very broadly at this whole world of resource management.

I guess, again, turning to something Mr. Cline commented on, last night he used the phrase to describe the Recreation and Parks Department, and he said they are in a phase of maturity. Well, we are 50 years old, and believe it or not, I believe we are still in the process of maturing. I don't think any of us should sit back and call ourselves experts. This infers that we know everything and have nothing else to learn. Quite the contrary, we have a great deal to learn, and we are all learners, and we should interact on that basis.

The only difference between people is some of us may know a little bit more than others at some particular time. Again, I think to express that maturing attitude we are very much getting involved with the public, we ourselves are going through a transition in doing this.

We were having lunch, and we were talking about different professional people, and we were talking about why people become foresters, and I think the term anti-social came up. Well anyway, we are working on it.

That is how I philosophize about the organization, and let's look at the Forest Service and recreation. You know, if you really look at it, the words recreation, parks and even any reference at all to people does not appear in our name. Good God, why are we in recreation? We really do have a very important role in recreation in Alberta.

Recreation is one of the products or benefits we produce or provide to this province as an agency. Basically, we have two things we provide - timber, rain and recreation. These are resource products, the rest of our functions for the most part are service functions, a lot to do with resource management control, resource regulation. We are involved in things like water quality monitoring, resource development regulations, forestry protection both in terms of fire and disease, and research. Those aren't really products, those

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

other things we do, those are management services.

The Alberta Forest Service has a legislative mandate, and I will read this paragraph here. Our mandate here is, "To manage the use and development of natural resources in the Green Area of Alberta." We do not, and I stress we do not, have a provincial-wide mandate. There is a lot of confusion about what the Forest Service can do in this province and what it can't do. We are very different from a lot of other agencies in Canada. The B.C. Forest Service has a provincial-wide mandate. Our mandate is confined to that area referred to as the Green Area, which is the forested two-thirds of the province, including the Eastern Slopes and the northern portion of the province.

The Forest Service as a division is part of a rather large department referred to as Energy and Natural Resources. There is several divisions - Fish and Wildlife, Public Lands, Mines and Minerals, so we are a pretty big organization, and we have got a lot of functions in life.

The Forest Service itself is a decentralized organization. We have six branches and a head office. The Forest Land Use Branch is an entity that is involved in recreation for the most part. We have a recreation section with six professional recreation planners. We have ten regional offices that we refer to as Forests. We only have three full-time recreation people in our setup. We have a full-time recreation section in Calgary, the Bow Crow Forest, Rocky Mountain House and at Edson. We kind of refer to it as we are creeping up the rock, but it is hard to say what is going to happen in Grande Prairie.

Within these forests they are broken up into ranger districts, and we have a total of about 47 ranger districts. In this time of restraint, we are actually going back to centralization, so maybe by next year we will only have 35 ranger districts.

But our recreation staff in the districts are very part time. We seem to have this attitude that forest officers are

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

generalists, jacks of all trades and masters of none. We haven't progressed with a lot of things that have been going on. We don't have sort of a specialist structure in the organization. There is some advantages with that, and there is a lot of disadvantages.

Speaking from my bias is purely interested in recreation but I find it's a helluva disadvantage. I go out to a district, and I get almost a new man every week to deal with.

Most of our recreation management is really done through seasonal staff - caretakers and guardians, and it does present a lot of problems. We are getting more and more involved in a year-round program, some of our areas are so heavily used and the facilities are to the point where we are almost appearing like a parks organization rather than Crown land management organization.

Generally speaking, the Alberta Forest Service is involved in outdoor recreation for two reasons; first of all, this primary land management responsibility. In this primary land management responsibility, we stress that we protect the natural integrity of the Green Areas from undue damage and overuse as a result of recreation activities.

This is sort of the fundamental reason for being in recreation and it's really why we got involved in the first place. We saw all this use moving out to the Green Area in the '60's and '70's, as managers we said we had concerns about all this pressure. I think maybe we felt that our private sanctity may be getting invaded by all these weirdos, I don't know. There was a lot of paranoia about forest fires, environmental damage, the need to concentrate, the need to control, the need to regulate. We seem to have all these very cold calculating objective reasons why we should get in the recreation business, and we forgot that one point that I think a couple of people mentioned this morning, Mr. Kun did, recreation is people. Sure we need resources, we need facilities, but first and foremost recreation is people, and you have to have this understanding of people. Again it is

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

an ability that we are just developing, it is something that by our formal training our, perhaps, personalities were not all that familiar with.

So in recent years we kind of took a stronger interest in recreation, in fact we came up with a formal program. We regarded ourselves as a public service agency to provide outdoor recreation opportunities through the development and delivery of programs and facilities. Heavy duty, it is almost competing with other agencies.

But in defining our program we said, we are not competing with other agencies, we are complementing them. You have to regard recreation as a very broad, especially if you sliver out outdoor recreation from the bigger line of recreation, it's a pretty dynamic large deal to be in. We tried to specifically identify what we felt our role was in outdoor recreation in Alberta. Firstly, we said, hey, our basic mandate is being a primary land manager. So we are in recreation to implement land use resource management legislation and policies to protect recreation values and to regulate recreation activities. Again, kind of a very indirect "I am in the recreation business" kind of approach.

Secondly we said, hey, we have got a very direct role in recreation, as a public service agency we should be delivering a program to provide a wide range of resource oriented, dispersed, extensive outdoor recreation opportunities within an integrated resource management framework. We have got all the right buzz words, and the definitions, and then we had to find out what those words meant. We kind of looked around and said, what's going on out there in the Green Areas? There's a whole lot of things going on out there in the Green Areas in recreation, we have got informal recreation, you can call it random, spontaneous, there is a lot of things going on out there. What we should be doing to enhance it, or encourage it, or just to make sure that what goes on there beats our other resource management purposes. We did things like trying to provide access to

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

public lands, tried to establish norms, acceptable norms of behavior to minimize conflict with the environment and also between users. We look at insuring a land base, you can't recreate if you've got no place to go.

We are even looking at things that Mr. Kun talked about this morning, the whole aspect of developing an appreciation and understanding of resources that are public, publicly available, and Jesus, you know, it may be nice to try to develop some skills.

The second aspect we looked at is we should be looking at formalized, organized public programs in the Green Area. No agency can do everything. You can't expect provincial parks to do all the recreation in Alberta, you can't expect the forest service to do it. There is a number of agencies that have a very wide ranging mandate that has some aspect of recreation involved in it. What can we do as an agency? Well, we can provide things like campsites, because people come out to camp. We are in the resource management business and we say we want to be in the recreation business so trails are neat, they are pretty formal. We can handle the informal stuff, but all these guys tearing around with their A.T.V.'s and stuff cause a lot of problems and maybe we can get them to use some trails.

The third area we are involved in is this private commercial sector, and what should we do in this area? Again, we should be providing some land base, trying to establish some conditions and some standards for development and operation. And we find that we are dealing with a whole myriad of this private commercial sector recreation. I think anything you can think of making money at could probably occur on Crown lands as commercial recreation. I will just give you a short list of things, of applications that we have received in my office in the last couple of years; cottages, cabins, group camps, skating rinks, ranges, rodeo grounds, racetracks, trail riding areas, outfitting, ski touring, canoing, rafting, wilderness education camps, hunting and

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

fishing lodges, guest ranches and resorts, ski hills and helicopter assisted activities. There is a lot of things that people want to try out there, and boy, sometimes if you sit back and say, gee I should give everybody what they want, you people with environmental concerns get a little bit upset. There just is not enough slice of the pie to give everybody everything they want.

So to recap, we saw our role as providing both formal and informal opportunities of a very dispersed oriented nature. Perhaps if you put things on a continuum from wilderness to athletic sports and events, you would probably, we would like to place ourselves on the wild land end of the scale, very compatible with the other functions we have as an organization. But as well as providing these formal and informal opportunities, we also felt secondly that we should be managing those public lands and natural features that support these opportunities.

And like all agencies in the 1970's we were under a lot of pressure during those boom times with dramatic increases in population, incredible access created by the resources industries and by exploration, major changes in recreational attitudes, people discovered winter, and some aspects of our programs right now we feel we have been forced out of the role we desire to be in. I'll talk about that a little later when I talk about some of our actual programs.

But we have been dabbling in this outdoor recreation quagmire for 15 or 20 years, and recently within the last five or ten years, we sat down and said we're going to have recreation, it's part of our goal in life as an agency, it's a spin-off of our primary mandate of being natural resource managers. But to give direction to our program, we sat down and developed a whole study, and we heard an awful lot of goal statements last evening from the three gentlemen here expressing their mandate, and it is very important to have a set of goals and objectives, everything has to stem from those. You have to reflect back on those and say gee, am I

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

really doing what I wanted to do? It is very important to define what you are trying to do to start with.

We really had a desire to become less reactive in our development and more integrated, not only in our development, but also in our planning and operations and maintenance. I think if you talk to any government official in this room he would tell you in the last ten years he has had very little time to do any long-range planning, it's been very reactionary, a lot of pressure.

So our goal as an agency in recreation is to provide resource oriented, dispersed, extensive recreation opportunities, and within that nebulous term, integrated resource management framework.

There we sat down and we looked at a number of programs to fulfill those objectives. We have got three major program areas, firstly it was camping, secondly, it was day use and thirdly it was trails. In camping we saw there is a lot of different types of camping. A certain client that kind of fit into the things we wanted to do, back country recreation, those are the types of clients we would like to provide opportunities for. I think there is some other departments that can take another client group, and maybe over time we could have a helluva system out here.

But as I say, during the '70's, we were under a lot of pressure, and we got involved in auto access campground business -- does anybody not know what an auto access campground is? Just your regular, big hundred-unit campground, you drive in in your Winebago and sit on your gravel pad with that fellow that mentioned the fire pit last night that was three and a half feet deep, very much a facility. The original site might have been identified because it was a fine feature and people wanted to go there because of the resources. But lo and behold, we ended up with a pretty big facility. And we were running around trying to build 25-unit campgrounds, and hey, there is no such animal. You are talking at a minimum size, a hundred

units right now in this province. Our user stats showed 25-unit campgrounds being used to 200 percent capacity. My boss says, what does that mean? Well that means there is 50 to 75 units in there every weekend.

And we really hung on to this theoretical yeah we are going to build these small campgrounds, provide different experiences, and by the way we don't have the money to build any bigger. We have just been going through some long-range planning in my section, and we kind of tied ourselves on to this philosophic objective of being in the disperse business, but we have got something like a hundred auto access campgrounds, and it's like an albatross. Nobody is in a position to take them over, everybody is in the same boat we are, and Jesus, if we don't do it, where are the people going to camp? Somebody has got to be out there.

So auto access camping we find a little bit inconsistent with the philosophy of the program that we would like to pursue. But right now, I think as a contributor to the auto access supply, it's a pretty major program. It takes about 60 percent of our budget. We have 3,000 camping units in operation at the present time.

Another camping program we looked at, again we didn't dream it up, we looked at B.C., we looked at Ontario, we looked at a lot of places and we also looked at what the people were doing in this province in terms of camping. Where they wanted to be and what they wanted to do.

We also talked with Fish and Wildlife and they were making some similar observations on some of the things that people want. Rather than what the manager wanted, we started looking at what the people wanted. They wanted access sites, or they wanted to be situated on rivers, streams, lakes. They weren't too interested in these gigantic campgrounds, they wanted a very simple facility at a base from which they could step out and do their thing.

We got into this program we call the water access program. It's a pretty new program for the Forest Service

and Fish and Wildlife, and it's an auto access program in terms of driving into the site. We don't look at a loop road in individual campsites, it's as one of my colleagues referred to it, he says, "It's a landscaped Safeway parking lot."

It's very interesting, we built one of these suckers up at Touchwood Lake right up beside the ranger campground last year, and we monitored, and you know the first one that filled up was that Safeway parking lot, that is how people want to be. So maybe we have got a hot project here and that's what some people really want. So we are really big on these water access points, and they are cheap as heck to build. Like you can build five units of water access points for every one unit in a regular campground, so in this time of restraint when we have to provide more opportunity, it's a pretty economical way to do it.

Right now we have ten water access points in operation, it comes to 250 units.

We also saw another trend in this province in the last couple of years and that is group camping. Not just group camping by organized groups, you folks could get together and have a weekend away as a group, family reunions, collective office groups. So group camping has become a very desirable type of activity in the province.

You have been to campgrounds before and even if you get three or four families together that are doing something they want to do as a group, it tends to encroach on the rest of the campers, it's a pretty high impact when you pack 16 or 20 people into one campsite. So we have got into the group camp business, and we have 20 of those sites right now.

We also toyed with overflow areas, and I think this is the dilemma of every recreation management agency, do you get involved in overflow areas or don't you? Again, it's perhaps a reflection of our paranoia about environmental impact, and boy we look at those big old gravel pits and mill sites we have, and we look at natural parks and crammed into theirs,

and jees, we have got a couple of those around the province. They don't seem to be very highly desirable, it's kind of a management panic reaction.

Okay, day use, we are not very big on day use in terms of picnic grounds and beaches. A lot of our facilities are just a little bit too far off the beaten track. We do have some areas particularly in the north that are very close to urban centres, so we have about a thousand picnic sites.

We also regard this water access point as a day facility. So then we get into the biggy, this thing called trails, and there is about 16,000 different types of trails you can build. We narrowed it down to four.

Again, we looked to our colleagues in the national parks we looked elsewhere. In the '70's we were under a lot of pressure from a couple of very strong user groups. We got involved doing trails, trying to come up with a standard trail that was acceptable to the user and acceptable to the budget. We also tried to use trail development as a means to let people enjoy sensitive areas, but to mitigate or reduce the impact.

Unfortunately, this big auto access albatross was soaking up all our money, so although we said we wanted to go into the trail business, we haven't been too successful in getting a lot of stuff off the ground. We are looking at hiking and back-packing trails, there are about 160 kilometers of formal trails. Again if we look at the lineal disturbance in Alberta, seismic and logging and the countless miles and miles of old back trails, and most of you probably have your own private place that you go to, 16 kilometers is a very very minimal amount compared to what is available for informal or random use.

Look at equestrian trails, and we have about 360 miles of formalized equestrian trails, and we are also running into those same problems of conflicts between horses and hikers. I understand that in Banff in talking to Jim, there is even now a conflict in Banff in the wintertime between dog sled

touring and cross-country skiiers, so we haven't got that one yet.

Cross-country skiing, this is a biggy, you know, we said cross-country skiing would be mostly day use, let's let the Municipal Recreation Board look after it. But we found that, especially in the northern communities where the Forest Service is one of the primary agencies out there, we do have the management mandate for all the land around these small towns that cross-country skiing was a pretty important program to get into. So we had 130 kilometers and six different systems of ski trails around the province.

And then the next two are the bad guys from your point of view, the motorized recreation. It is very interesting, about a month ago there was a group about this size in Red Deer talked about snomobiling, and you talk to some of those people and they have the same appreciation and desires as back-packers in terms of "I want to have a quality experience", and they are concerned about the protection of the environment. The only way I'm different is my mode of recreation. One elderly fellow there, he was over 50, I think he really summed it up. He talked about recreation activities and recreation trends, and he said, you know, in the '60's when snomobiling took off it was a fad, everybody and their kid brother was involved in it, and we matured as a user group. The guys that were 25 or 30 years old in the '50's that were just giving her hell with those snow machines are now a very responsible citizen, and they are basically continued in that sport, saying this is what I would like doing, and I like doing it in a quality environment. I'm going to try to minimize my impact, I realize I do have some impact. They also pointed out that all those orangutans that we tie everybody that has a motorized piece of equipment with are now into things like dirt bikes and big four by fours, and most of those guys go up and down the main drag in Calgary. It was interesting to see the maturing of motorized recreationists and the people who stayed with snomobiles who

have some similar attitudes and commitments as environmental people do.

We got involved in snomobiling as a result of a major political commitment, and it wasn't a very logical commitment, but we managed to work with snomobilers and look at their needs, and they don't want a whole lot of formalized trails either, they like to have some informal opportunities. But we do have 700 kilometers of trails, about 11 trail systems.

We are just getting into the A.T.V. area now in terms of trikes and dirt bikes, and there is 400 kilometers of those types of trails, and we're finding that motorized recreation is one of the most difficult groups to work with because they have such a ranging motive for doing it. A lot of people that we tend to generalize and say everybody's like this that are really interested in getting their jollies driving those machines over anything, and they really make up a smaller segment of that user group than you think they do.

Okay, to conclude I thought I would outline some of our concerns as a recreation agency in Alberta. You notice I am now referring to it as a recreation agency. I wasn't sure whether I should entitle or word these as major issues, because that is a rather negative approach, or as perhaps a more positive note maybe we should term it future objectives. I chose the latter, the positive approach just to indicate to you people that we do have a desire to be part of and to improve the outdoor recreation system in Alberta. It is very interesting, I wrote this a couple of days ago, and Denis Moffat last night talked about some of the things that are occurring in B.C., some of the continuing problems in B.C. are a lot of the things that I identified in Alberta.

So again I will point out these five or six points as objectives and then let Bill have the podium here. I guess the first objective I would like to see in the future is a clarification of the role of the various government agencies involved in recreation. The economic times may force us to

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Rogers)

become more cooperative. I think we have to become systems builders rather than empire builders. My boss gets very up-tight when I use that term empire builders, I think that is a negative characteristic that a lot of people have. So I think there is a need for, well put it this way, I think we should coordinate the delivery of public programs and services between agencies, whether it is just information provided to the public, whether it is joint development as we are doing now with Fish and Wildlife, looking at coordination of operations and particularly and most importantly coordination of plans.

I think over the long run, and I am not running for any political party here, I think over the long run there needs to be less government and more commercial and private involvement in recreation. I think the user over the long term has to do more things for themselves, whether it is actually developing, operating or maintaining or programming facilities. I think we as government have some support systems in place in terms of advisory groups, special interest groups, granting groups. We have some mechanisms in place that we could work with these user groups, but I think there has come a time that, and again I could look at other aspects in life other than recreation, a lot of people are going to have to learn to do a lot more things for themselves. On the one hand the public is telling the government they want smaller civil service, they want smaller budgets, less taxes, in order to do that I think people have to assume, in terms of recreation, more of their own destiny.

Another objective I would like to see is more interaction and cooperation between user groups at the local, regional and provincial levels. Perhaps government can be a catalyst to make this occur. We are actually looking at some of those things that Mr. Moffat was talking about last night, perhaps we need a recreation group council of user groups, perhaps we need some local or regional organizations in terms

of recreation. Right now our user groups, such as yourselves, are sort of under an environmental title, and yet the topic of this conference and a lot of the interest in this group here is in recreation. So perhaps rather than disguising recreation interests behind some other purpose in life, we should perhaps set up some type of recreation group.

The fifth objective is that I think we should be providing a range of outdoor recreation closer to urban centres. I think it doesn't sound very logical for me to take $100,000 and go and build some snomobile trails out at Hinton for the people that live there. There is a lot of Crown land around Edmonton that is very suitable for snomobiling, hunting, skiing. Hunting, there is lots of opportunities close at home, and I think we perhaps have overlooked these things. In order to do that, I think we have to wrestle with that provisional agricultural land use, and I know Dr. Swinnerton has done a lot of work on that. Grazing, the issue of grazing and how much control a farmer has over a piece of land, it's a very sensitive topic in Alberta when you look at grazing and agriculture as part of our heritage. And this outdoor recreation is a pretty new animal on the scene.

Again, I have two final ones here, more specific to the Forest Service. I think it is going to be very important that we determine how much wilderness is enough. How much is really required. If we keep going after this nebulous amount, we are all going to lose. I think we have to work together to define how much is enough and go after it so that we as a management agency can supply it. I think this has been the attitude in Alberta when you look at this eight percent of Alberta is tied up in national parks, something like that, and it's a pretty big slice of land. I think if I was a Premier and somebody was coming up and asking me for some more wilderness and I was faced with some economic decisions and I saw I had eight percent and nobody told me I needed any more or any less, I think I would have a hard

time. So I think we should identify how much is appropriate. So I think we have to make the distinction between wilderness and wildlife.

My seventh objective, and it is more to our organization, I think we have to come up with an effective way to manage motorized recreation. There is more toys out there than you could shake a stick at. How many people here have an A.T.V., let's see what kind of group this is? Boy, everybody's nervous, eh? Okay, there is a lot of it going on and I think we have to accept that it has become a very dominant and legitimate recreation use, not only in Alberta, but in North America. But there has to be a way of providing satisfying opportunities for those type of users, while at the same time protecting natural resources. So that's an objective that we are looking at as an organization.

I look forward to your questions, I probably took 45 minutes, but thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: I would like to thank Barry, our next speaker is Mr. Bill Shaw.

MR. SHAW: Cliff Lacey assured me the water is safe, so I brought it up here although I'm not too sure sometimes.

Anyway, I would also like to thank the Advisory Committees of the E.C.A. for giving me the opportunity to come up here and speak to you with regards to the role of Regional Planning Commissions in outdoor recreation in the Province of Alberta. Many of you may be asking what is a Regional Planning Commission, and not only that, what do they have to do with recreation? I was just sitting there looking at the audience, and I have personally, or the people in the office have interacted with a dozen of you out there over the years, perhaps more environmentally than recreation, but it is pretty hard to separate recreation from the environment. So at least in the 12 or 13 years I have been with the Commission I have been very much oriented towards

environmental problems and concerns, and they do touch upon recreation.

I am pleased to see Mr. Flook and various other E.C.A. people, we used to meet two or three times a year, but they don't let me out anymore, I am more or less desk-bound, so I am really grateful for the opportunity to come to Banff today. I might have been a bit more grateful if the golf course was open and there was more snow at Lake Louise, but I will certainly take this day.

With regards to responsibilities of Regional Planning Commissions and recreation, I would just like to go to the overhead. If I can just quickly refer to that and then we'll run through some slides with respect to it. Regional Planning Commissions have a variety of roles and responsibilities, and I have just generalized them into two facets for this presentation. One is regulatory and the other is advisory, and we work basically on three levels - provincial level, regional level and municipal level. On the regulatory side at the municipal level, the Commission is the subdivision approving authority. At the regional level, we are responsible for preparing regional plans, and I will talk about that a little later, because it will affect all other aspects of our goals.

On the advisory side, we are advocates of certain things, and we advocate at both the provincial and regional levels. When we get down to the local level, we are more local planning advisers working one-on-one with municipalities. We also act as consultants at all three levels - provincial, regional and local, and then also and finally we even act as designers for recreational facilities for certain municipalities.

What I'd like to point out before I go through the slides are a few main points. First of all unlike some of the other agencies that are here today, Regional Planning Commissions are not facilitators, we do not have a mandate to provide facilities. However, in many ways we can be a

means to the end. We don't provide the end product, but we can help or push for it.

In that regard, we advocate provision of outdoor recreational facilities and outdoor recreational opportunities, to promote that we promote the conservation of key resources to sustain those types of activities. In doing that, we observe trends and needs, social and environmental, and try to interpret those into programs, regional recreational place systems or policies to push for the provision of recreational opportunities, not only in our region, but also in the Province of Alberta.

I would like to explain what Regional Planning Commissions are: Regional Planning Commission consist of a group of municipalities within the boundaries defined by the Government of Alberta. Each municipality has the right to send a member of the elected local council to the Commission to act as a Commission member and make the decisions that a Regional Planning Commission is responsible for.

In the Province of Alberta, the government has set up ten Regional Planning Commissions that cover most of the Province of Alberta with the exception of the northeast and the east central area. These are the boundaries of the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission, it centres on Red Deer, stretches from Banff National Park 180 or 200 miles to the east to Coronation. The funding of the Regional Planning Commissions are basically threefold. We are a subdivision of the approving authority, we are required to adopt regional plans, to provide planning advice for local municipalities, and we also provide local planning advice to the municipalities, and you will see a number of slides of how we react to municipalities in that regard.

With respect to our regulatory function, as I mentioned, the Regional Planning Commission is the subdivision approving authority for land, and any land that is to be subdivided has to go through the Commission, and the

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Shaw)

Commission through the Planning Act subdivision regulations are entitled to take something called municipal reserves with respect to those subdivisions. And through municipal reserves we can maintain open spacing in urban areas, we can gain play areas for kids and older people in the subdivision of land in municipal reserves we can get school yards and associated playgrounds, and we can also get space for recreational facilities in municipalities.

We can also take another type of reserve, a special kind of reserve called environmental reserve. And under subdivision, we can get environmental reserve to protect the beds and shores of lakes and rivers and provide public access, or we can take lands that are unstable or unsuitable for development and maintain them, or in fact we can take, as well, other forms of land, we can take swamps that are really unsuitable for development and use them to preserve the environment. This is very important, if not a small aspect of Regional Planning Commissions, whereby some of the recreational objectives and needs of municipalities and people can be met.

The second aspect related to regional plans, I prefer not to call regional planning regulatory, but the Alberta Planning Board is moving us more and more into a regulatory fashion. Really what we are doing there is requiring municipalities to do special things to protect the environment and to do proper land use plans. And I guess in that we are forcing them to do planning, it is regulatory, but the Commission doesn't do it, it only advises.

In our regional plan, which is the policy framework to provide a framework for local planning for the municipalities to take action, and also to guide the province with respect to some of their programs as it affects our region. Especially of interest for this group today in our regional plan is that we identify recreational resources within our region. In doing that, we promote their conservation and their use in a manner which is sensitive to the

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Shaw)

characteristics of that resource.

We have identified four broad types of recreation resources, being major open spaces, or natural monuments including natural areas such as the Kootenay Plains, also heritage resources and the fourth type is historic sites such as the historic significance of the North Saskatchewan River.

The second major aspect of interest to this group is with regards to identifying sensitive lands. They often have recreational implications to them. Again we promote their conservation and proper use.

We recognize five types, being sanctuaries, a form of natural monuments, the Eastern Slopes as a second type, critical or key habitat areas, and a third type, and then extensive forms of environment such as river valleys and lake shores. Very important sensitive environments that have implications for recreation and many other forms of competing uses.

Going on to the advisory side, we act as advocates, as I said before. At the provincial level we promote recognition and the protection and advocate policies with respect to the proper use of various resources including recreational resources such as, in the Eastern Slopes for their integrated resource management, including for recreation. Or, as we mentioned earlier, for the Red Deer River and very much promoting and recognizing the recreational significance of this very important resource to our region.

We have also taken a major role in about 1974 together with the City of Red Deer and the County of Red Deer and approached the then Minister, promoting that the government recognize the strategic importance of the river valley in and around the City of Red Deer. Lo and behold, about eight years later there was a $28,000,000 corridor park in and around the City of Red Deer which is now actively being built and coming to fruition in two or three years. Cliff Lacey will probably talk about that a little later.

At the regional level we were the first Commission to

promote region-wide lakeshore prospectives to plan our lakeshores in an integrated proper manner. These are very important resources for recreation as well as other uses within our region. We also recognized in the mid to late '70's, this is something that Barry was speaking about earlier, that the lack of coordination and coherence in recreation planning and the provision of facilities within our region, and as well the province. So we came up with our own regional recreation place system to try and promote the conservation and systematic recognition of specific recreational resources. We broke them down into six, I'm sure the people in recreation wouldn't agree with our terminology, but basically they have the differences between integrity of user and the integrity of the environment, and they go from intensified to very pristine types of environment.

One, we promote structural facilities such as ballparks and playgrounds. Secondly, we recognize and promote resource facilities, those are resource orientated such as private and public campgrounds. Thirdly, we recognize the extreme importance of extensive environmental areas such as river valleys and wetland habitats.

Fourthly, the importance of historical resources, whether it be specific sites or historical areas. Fifthly, natural monuments, the natural things that God has provided us to enjoy such as waterfalls or geological formations, or many other types of natural features.

Then finally we recognize and promote the need for primitive environments, whether they be wilderness areas, wild rivers or wild wilderness lakes.

So, being advocates at the provincial and regional level, once we get down to the local level we are working more as specific planning advisers for local municipalities, and we do that through general use plans, providing help to municipalities to recognize and plan for and accommodate recreational areas within specific municipalities. This is

an urban example, we also do it for rural municipalities.

We even undertake more detailed plans for specific resources, in this instance for the shorelands around the new Dickson Reservoir where we have come up, together with public and technical people, with a management plan to protect the shorelands for public access recreation as well as for habitat and agriculture.

A member of our staff has worked very much on the Waskasu Park on the Red Deer program, in fact our office prepared the master plan for that park. Here is a couple of examples of what is happening right now in Red Deer, it is really exciting.

Our consultation role again relates at the provincial and regional levels. We initiated some of the lakeshore planning in the province, and these were brought together with Alberta Environment to discuss with them the use of our lakeshores for land use. Again, we also coordinate with local municipalities and government agencies resource plans for strategic resources within a region. We advise or consult with E.N.R., for example, on forest planning in the Eastern Slopes on some of the components including recreation, and we work as consultants for Alberta Environment, when I say consultants I mean more advisers, with respect for example, for the recreational components on lake stabilization schemes. We have promoted and consulted and advised municipalities on resource management of strategic river valleys. We have worked with municipalities and Alberta Environment on land use and flood plains, including for recreational uses; and we have tried to promote the concept of wild and scenic rivers in our region, for example, the very important upstream portions of the Red Deer River.

At the local level we act as an adviser or consultant on local facility planning such as for campgrounds. This is an example in Burnstick Lake Improvement District No. 10. We also can prepare urban parklands for civic beautification

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Shaw)

for example. For some municipalities we have prepared site plans for heritage resources or museum areas. And then again, a member of our staff acting on behalf of the City of Red Deer, is advising consultants who are preparing site plans and detailed plans for Waskasu Park in the City of Red Deer. So with that very major park, for example, the Commission has been involved right from the beginning about ten years ago.

Our clients are primarily local authorities, municipalities. We work for local authorities. We work for urban and rural municipalities. But also on behalf and for municipalities, we do advise the private sector such as those who are interested in campgrounds, and those who are interested in providing cottages, and those who are interested in providing major recreation facilities. We don't do the consulting work for them, they do it, but we advise them with respect to their acceptability to the local municipalities.

Our final role is that of designers. It doesn't happen too often, but at times we do in fact do designs for municipal parks, for example, this one in the County of Painter adjacent to the Battle River.

Through all of those responsibilities, what are the purposes and objectives of a Regional Planning Commission? Firstly is the provision of opportunities for recreation. Whether it's a provincial campground, or whether it is a local recreation facility, that is one of our main objectives to push for the provision of these opportunities. Secondly, is to conserve our environment or our heritage, whether it be historical buildings, sensitive amenities, whether it be flora, or whether it be fauna.

A third very important aspect in our objectives is to promote land use that is done in harmony with our environment and in harmony with each other, for example, through proper planning and management we can avoid these types of things, and have this. We can avoid what I would call scars on the

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Shaw) (Bloomfield)

landscape and integrated with our landscape. We can promote the avoidance of these types of heavy abuses, or visual abuses anyway on lakeshores, and promote this type of thing. Through the cottage subdivision area it is not so visible.

Also, we can avoid these types of scenes and have private development more in harmony with our environment. We also, of course, want to promote harmony amongst land uses, and this often happens in a region very similar to real examples in our region of these types of things. So we promote land use patterns to avoid those types of conflicts.

Fourthly, we are planning for people. In doing our studies and doing our drafting, we have got to recognize that people are interacting with the environment. We are planning for people and their use of the environment - lakeshores, rivers, facilities within urban centres or the remotest parts of our regions. We are planning for people.

Not only that, we are planning with people, we do involve people in our planning process in meetings, or right out in the field in outdoor studies. And through all of this, Commissions I think are mindful of environmental sensitivity, whether it be for lakeshores, prairies, or river valleys, pristine mountain areas or mountain areas that have been affected by man.

I just have one question left to ask; what will we be leaving for other people, and I think Commissions through their actions wish to leave for future generations, whether it be wildlife or whether it be people, I think what Commissions are trying to do is to leave a legacy of outdoor recreation for future generations.

I would be also willing to respond to questions at a later time in the program. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: Thank you, Bill; our final speaker for this panel discussion will be Ms. Jan Bloomfield.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: Good afternoon, everyone, I would like to thank you as well for inviting me to this session today.

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

I find it is quite a treat to be able to visit Alberta's major tourist destination area. I hurt somebody's feelings at the back, but basically the prime destination in Alberta is Banff.

It is a treat for me as manager of a planning unit to be able to come to the mountains, most of our study areas are in other parts of the province where the tourist industry is somewhat less, and also less developed, so not as pleasant an experience.

I have been asked to outline briefly the programs that Travel Alberta is involved in in terms of outdoor recreation and tourism development. I will briefly go through some of the program areas, I don't have time to expand very much on all of them, the primary ones I would like to talk about are all tourism destination areas in the planning programs, and a couple of other product specific programs in terms of farm vacations and winter activity programs.

I am going to use some slides as we go along too, it might help to break the monotony. I don't think they're quite as good as Bill's, I was a little bit put to shame, but this is what I put together in a hurry the other day.

Firstly, I would just like to run through briefly a few of the things, I guess some of the important points relative to tourism in the province that I think we should be aware of. First of all our definition of tourism tends to be anyone who travels from his home more than 50 miles or 80 kilometers, whatever the destination is. And he can be a business traveller, he can be a recreationist, he can be a pleasure seeker, whatever. It's pretty well all-encompassing, and all of us here today are tourists accessing in Banff.

Tourism is a rapidly growing industry throughout the world, what we need to do though is to develop some of the tourism potential that we have in the province, in Canada as well, in terms of attractions, events, facilities, things for people to do so that we can meet the anticipated demands for tourism in the future. In spite of our poor economic

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

conditions at the present time, it is felt travel will continue to be a way of life. In fact, to many people, travel is considered to be a right, not just a privilege. People feel they owe themselves a vacation.

I think if we look at the annual winter exodus of Albertans to places like Hawaii and other sunny spots in the south, I think that reflects the concern that travel is a way of life.

The travelling public is also aging. The baby boom generation is grown up, we are a fairly large portion of the population. People are looking for quality experiences, they want value for their money. People also want educational experiences. This opens the door for major interpretive programs, it opens the door for training programs, skills, training, et cetera.

There is a trend away from the long haul touring holiday in a private vehicle that we used to take when we were younger. We are more destination oriented. We arrive in one spot, we may tour around that area, but we like to spend our time without having to do a lot of long distance travel. The cost of gas is one consideration in that factor.

As I mentioned, in Alberta the major destination is Banff, and an attitude study was carried out by Travel Alberta within the last couple of years corresponding with people who had written to Travel Alberta over the past few years. It was found that indeed Banff is synonymous with Alberta. People come to Alberta to see the Rocky Mountains, particularly Banff in the park.

The other prime destination in Alberta is Jasper, and also the cities of Edmonton and Calgary which are the major gateways into the province for travellers. This is at a different time of the year in Banff, and you can also see there is quite a bit of use. The other potential destination in the province as well as the mountains, and I guess our most significant would be southeastern Alberta, Dinosaur Provincial Park, the Drumheller dinosaur corridor in

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

particular. Other portions are the Eastern Slopes which are also significant, for example, the Crowsnest Pass area. I think it was discussed earlier today in terms of tourism being a major industry in Alberta, being the third largest. It is a major revenue producer in the province, and in 1982 it was conservatively estimated that $1.24 billion in revenue was generated in Alberta as a result of tourism. If additional destination areas were developed in parts of the province that were major attractions such as in the dinosaur/Drumheller area and the Crowsnest Pass area, there's a possibility that we might keep some of the Albertans home that tend to go to B.C. or other parts of the country for their summer vacations, where leasing regulations and Crown lands et cetera are somewhat different than they are in Alberta.

If we were to allow resort development in the Eastern Slopes, it may keep people here who would normally go to Fairmont or Radium or to other places in B.C.

The prospects for tourism are tremendous in Alberta, but we have to remember that poorly planned tourism opportunities can result in a loss of or deterioration of a natural resource that are the attractions for tourism in the first place. The overriding thing we have to remember is we can't destroy what we are getting the people to come and see in the first place.

Public agencies such as Tourism and Small Business have traditionally emphasized their promotion and marketing role. Plannings and developments of facilities and attractions in the province have been left to the private sector or to public agencies such as provincial parks and the Alberta Forest Service, particularly for the provision of some services such as campgrounds and park facilities. Most of this occurs in the private sector on an ad hoc basis in the past. While most of the programs provided by government were valid programs, they were only responding to a small portion of the demand and needs of tourists. As Barry alluded to

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

earlier, there is a need, or there is still a need for coordinated approach for planning for recreation in the province, but also for tourism in the province. In 1979 Travel Alberta initiated a program that was intended to help resolve some of these problems. This was a tourism destination and planning program. That program was designed to identify tourism opportunities, particularly for the private sector, in alternative destinations areas throughout the province.

There was also an attempt to determine how the various tourist attractions, facilities could be coordinated throughout the province so that we weren't providing competing opportunities throughout the province, but complimentary opportunities for tourism.

As I indicated, in 1979 this program was initiated, but basically at the present time we are working on ten site areas throughout the province. The areas in black are the areas that we are currently not looking at, so we are covering a large portion of the province at the present time.

The initial program boundaries follow what Travel Alberta representatives felt were boundaries that reflect the natural resource features, tourism patterns, et cetera. We are somewhat different from what the boundaries are at the present time. As a result of public input, particularly the Tourism Association of Alberta representatives, they are the private sector leg of the tourism industry in Alberta, we revised our boundaries to correspond to the tourism zone boundaries that are in place already, fourteen in total. This was an attempt to help the zone plan for better marketing strategy in the zones, and also to make it easier for the public to relate to tourism opportunities that we were identifying with the tourism boundaries that everybody already knew.

The planning program followed basically a four-phase process; Phase 1 inventory analysis; Phase 2 preparation of a development concept; Phase 3 specific feasibility follow-up

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

studies; Phase 4 the implementation. I will briefly run through and highlight some of the aspects of these programs.

Phase 1 is the tourism inventory assessment phase. The main bulk of this work is done by private consultants throughout the province. The consultants inventory a variety of natural cultural features et cetera throughout the province. Some of the kinds of things they look at within a specific study area are the physical resources, lakes and beach resources, fishing opportunities, river resources and some of our wildland areas, existing park resources and natural environment settings, and scenic viewing opportunities. They also look at cultural resources as well throughout the province, things like Writing-On-Stone Provincial Park; Beech colleries, this is now a major interpretive centre in the Crowsnest Pass; Medalta Potteries, an old historic place which has potential as a major living, working museum. They also look at industrial resources, the touring and interpretive opportunities that exist at these various facilities, things like the Taber sugar beet factory, the oil and gas activities throughout the province, there are varying kinds of interpretive possibilities for the oil and gas activities.

Coal mining may be something that most of us wouldn't like to see, but there are interpretive facilities to help the public, I guess, understand more fully the economic opportunities of the province, and agricultural resources.

They also inventory tourism facilities and services, things like regional ski hills, water slides as you go through Medicine Hat and Sylvan Lake, museums, this one being in Hanna, and campgrounds throughout the province. They also look at specific events. They try to acquire attendance statistics where possible, many events don't keep a record of them, and it is very important because it certainly would help in developing marketing of the various events if they had a better record of their users. The kinds of events include rodeos. The great Canadian riverboat race up in the

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

Grande Cache area. Things like winter carnivals, I think Barry will recognize himself here, a good slide and an opportunity to prove that people in the government that work in planning and recreation do try and go out and experience recreation activities.

The consultants also look at activities in tourism and recreation, both in the province and throughout Canada and the U.S. Things like fishing opportunities, wildlife viewing, boating, water skiing, even in the middle of the prairies, this is Chain Lakes. Auto touring, this is dinosaur trail in the Drumheller area, camping and hiking activities, beach activities, commercial rafting, canoeing, trail riding, ballooning, cross-country skiing and snomobiling. Once the consultant's inventories are completed, they are released on a fairly wide distribution to the public. We then hold a series of open houses which are intended to bring the local people together to talk to the Travel Alberta planning staff about what they feel the reports covered, what was missing, where the good potentials were, anything that they felt should happen in the planning area. It is also hoped that through some of these public input areas, we can publicize some of the programs of Travel Alberta such as the hospitality training program and a few counselling services, et cetera, that we provide.

The next step following the public open houses is taking the information that we compiled from the consultant's studies, from open houses, from meetings with government agencies like Fish and Wildlife, Forest Services, talk to Regional Planning Commissions, et cetera, and put together a tourism development concept discussion paper.

The tourism development discussion paper, and this is just a table of contents, indicates some of the things that we cover. Things like objectives for tourism development in the area, a broad summary of resources within the study area, and a listing of the tourism opportunities as have been assigned to us through all the public and various sources

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

which is then put through basically a subjective evaluation and we look at things like how the opportunities relate to the tourism goals and objectives in the areas. The level of significance, if it's a national significance opportunity, or in fact it is only a local/regional opportunity. What commitment there is already, or if there is any potential for development, what kind of citizen support there is for development. Also whether there is a resource base capable of developing that opportunity.

The key tourism opportunities are identified, analyzed further and mapped for information in this report. The report is then released to the public and we have a public workshop which is a more formalized session. We sit down with a select group of people from the local communities and discuss the tourism opportunities.

The third phase is the feasibility studies, follow-up study. At this phase we take some of the specific tourism opportunities that have been identified as having a lot of potential, and where required, we do background work that will assist the private sector, or someone else, the government in some cases but not usually, to determine whether it is feasible to proceed with additional development of that opportunity. Unfortunately because of our budget restraints we haven't been able to hire a consultant to do any more studies. One of the most recent ones was the Westcastle Feasibility Study, and this study proved that in fact it is very feasible to develop a major ski facility and resort complex at Westcastle. Feasible in the sense that the site is physically capable, there are a lot of hurdles that have to be overcome before anything can be developed in the East Slopes Zone, et cetera.

Some of the work on the follow-up studies is also done by in-house staff. For example, at the present time we are doing a tourism development concept for the Drumheller dinosaur corridor looking at transportation route alternatives in the area and recreation and tourism opportunities that

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Bloomfield)

could be developed making it a major tourism corridor.

The fourth phase is implementation. This is one of our biggest stumbling blocks in the program is that we don't have a funding mechanism to assist the private sector to go forward and develop some of the opportunities that have been identified. We do act as a catalyst in the sense of providing counselling and planning assistance to individuals wishing to proceed with development. We help them I guess in the sense of liaison with other government agencies where applicable to help point them in the direction of funding sources that might be available to them. Some of the examples of where we have been working is in the Cold Lake area. We are quite excited about what is happening in Cold Lake at the present time. The Economic Development Committee have agreed or decided to go forward with one of the recommendations that were made during our initial phase of study for the Cold Lake area to make Cold Lake into a resort community. They are concerned right now with developing major marina facilities, boardwalks and basically proving the town's feasibility as a tourism resort.

As I indicated, we have a few problems in the program, the lack of funding being one of the major problems. It is also difficult to encourage the private sector to develop in times of economic constraints. We can indicate where there are opportunities, but at the present time it may not be viable for them to go ahead.

It is also difficult in terms of our public participation program. I think we have a fairly effective program, except perhaps in the open house phase where we try to encourage the general public to get involved in what we are doing. It is very difficult to have the public come out to discuss something that doesn't have a negative impact on them in the immediate short term. We put forward a lot of ideas to try to encourage the public to get involved in tourism, and we hope to have them recognize that for tourism to be viable in the community, everybody has to

participate. There has to be a good hospitality service industry from the way you are treated in the restaurant to the motel clerks, the gas station attendants, all the way down the line everybody has to participate and make people feel like guests. That is a major problem to overcome.

Another problem we are facing in the planning program is that until recently tourism had a very low priority in terms of preparing integrated management plans for the province for Crown lands. We are having some support now from political allies, I suppose, in terms of opening up additional lands for tourism throughout the province. As I indicated earlier, our biggest concern here is ensuring that when opening up lands for development for tourism that we don't destroy the very resources that people are coming to see.

And the fifth problem with the program is the one that Barry alluded to earlier, reactionary planning. We have very limited resources in our planning program, we have very extensive major programs, but we haven't got much further than the Phase 1 inventory and the initiation of development concepts in any of the areas. We are too much involved in the reactionary planning to be able to follow through to the final implementation phase.

I will briefly run through, I know I am running out of time here, but I would like to touch on a couple of the other programs I mentioned. The farm vacation program is one of the things that we are fairly active in at the present time. The program is fairly new to Alberta, it has been a vacation activity in other provinces for quite some time, for example, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba. Basically the idea of a farm vacation is that the farmer or ranch operator will open up his home or his operation for visitors. There are several kinds of programs that can occur, he can open up his own house using some of his spare rooms, he can have a separate building to house visitors, or he can have a campground. He can allow the people to participate a

hundred percent in his day-to-day activities, milking cows, feeding chickens, et cetera, or he can let them do whatever they want, hiking up or trail riding, or whatever he has.

In 1982 there were only 15 farm vacations operating in Alberta, plus two other ones that have a campground facility rather than an actual farm vacation. In 1984 our accommodation guide from Travel Alberta there are 22 farms and ranch vacations listed. The major market for farm vacations in Alberta at the present time is Albertans. We have come up with a bit of a profile of the visitor to the farm vacation facility, and it tends to be a young family, urban dweller with very little exposure to rural environment. At the present time Travel Alberta is actively involved in seeking new farm vacation operators throughout the province, and also in counselling new and existing operators in terms of economics, et cetera.

It is interesting that most farming vacation operators do not want to have a hundred percent occupancy at their establishments. Most of the use is during July and August, and the average occupancy is about 15 to 20 percent, fairly low. However, the operators that are involved in the program feel quite satisfied with that. I guess it gives them the opportunity to have some free time on their own without having visitors around, and it gives them the experience of showing off some of the things that they are involved in on the farm and in their programs. Some of the problems I guess are things that have to be looked out for in terms of farm vacation operators is they have to be viable operations to begin with. It would be very difficult to initiate a farm vacation operation if the farming operation itself was not already viable. You also need to have a very people-loving family, I guess, to become the host operator, otherwise it just wouldn't work.

There are several other projects or programs that Travel Alberta is involved in from an promotion program and consulting service sense, and these are the commercial trail

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON (Bloomfield)

riding, and these are the commercial trail riding, guest ranches and fly-in fishing lodges. Just to give a few statistics on these, I'm not going to go into detail, in 1982 there were 18 commercial trail riding operations in Alberta and the market for these was largely Albertans followed by other Canadian and U.S. visitors. There were five guest ranches in 1982, and this is one of our major attractions for the European visitors because the market for the guest ranches is fairly evenly split between Albertans, other Canadians, the U.S. and Europe. In 1982 there were seven operating fishing lodges in the province, and again here the major market was Alberta.

The last program area I would like to talk about is the winter activities program. This is a fairly new area that we are trying to get involved in in Alberta. Downhill skiing has been the biggest major winter attraction in Alberta for quite some time and it still is. However, because of the length of our winter season, and the severity of our winter season, it is imperative that additional opportunities and activities be developed in Alberta. At the present time a large market, or a large proportion of our market goes to B.C. for activities such as skiing, downhill skiing where they have on-site accommodation, on-hill accommodation, and snowmobiling where there is a more extensive trail system and a more lax attitude, I guess, towards providing food services, accommodation services in conjunction with the trails.

At the present time, Travel Alberta is working with several operators trying to develop a variety of attractions and activities in the province that will be attractive for winter tourism. Some of these things include dog sledding, winter camping, cross-country ski development and winter use of guest ranches for things such as cross-country skiing or snowmobiling. We have been working to a certain extent with the Alberta Snowmobiling Association and with Alberta Forest Service in terms of trying to coordinate the use of the existing trails and the further expansion and development of

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON (Bloomfield)

these trails to viable routes for winter touring activities. One of the things that we see necessary is provision of overnight facilities along some of these trails and tying the trails in with communities so that snowmobilers can go into communities such as Swan Hills or Whitecourt, book into a hotel and be able to snowmobile away from the hotel accommodation and get on to a main trail network, come back into the community for food services, et cetera.

I guess the last thing I should touch on, and I don't want to talk about it, but I should also point out some of the programs that Travel Alberta is involved in related to Kananaskis Country. We have been involved in negotiations with the Ribbon Creek alpine village development, with the Fortress Junction Service centre, and certainly in terms of the development at Mount Allan ski development; I don't have time to go into those programs. I don't have the inclination to go into them either.

Those are basically the programs, and I am quite willing to answer any questions you may have. I have some brochures with me on some of the activity programs I just referred to, and also a brochure on some of the things, the program areas that Travel Alberta is involved in, and people that are interested can contact for further information on things like Kananaskis if you want. Those will be available outside if anybody wants them. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: Thank you very much, Jan. Do any of the panel members wish to respond to each other's presentation? You are all satisfied, so we will be open now for questions from the audience. Will you remember to identify yourself by name and by the group you are representing before you ask your question, and who the question is addressed to.

MR. PASCHEN: Gerry Paschen, Non-Renewable. I have been a member of the Canadian Youth Hostel Association for many years, in fact I am a life member, and it's fine that we

talk about parks and new trails, et cetera, but there is one item you have overlooked and that is the Youth Hostels Association. It happened to be in Germany that this started off, and what we need to do in Canada is to make provision for the youth. In other words, overnight shelters that are mentioned here that a student can Ski-Doo from point to point such as we have just now here, I guess, it was Swan Hills. I think there is two hiking and bicylcling also available, and I do believe that our government needs to set aside that there is an acre or two available here in the area doesn't necessarily have to be a park, a youth hostel can be built, and I feel that is an outlet for all Canadian youth, and there is plenty of them. So that I hope that you can tell us more about it and I don't want to see the whole issue relaxed. Youth hostelling started in Canada in 1938, and if you think back with all the prosperity we have had and then so little money comes from federal and provincial sources, I think it has to pay, so think about the Canadian youth. Thank you.

MR. LILLEY: John Lilley, Environment Council. Through these three talks which are from very different points of view, different levels of government organizations, we have got some idea of recreation development. Each of the speakers mentioned the need for integration and coordination of the provision of recreation facilities, and I think Jan indicated to some extent that this coordination can be done. So we have here only three representatives of three groups providing recreation facilities, and there are a number of organizations, including Alberta Environment, Recreations and Parks, municipalities, et cetera, who are all providing recreation facilities. I was just wondering if any or all of you would like to comment on how the provision of recreation facilities, how the integration of these recreation facilities are being handled by government?

MR. ROGERS: I guess as I'm the oldest person at this table that I answer it. I think there has been perhaps

a lot of good interaction and coordination at the work level amongst government agencies. Unfortunately a lot of those major programs policy integrations has to occur at a much senior level, I think that's a point that is becoming rather obvious amongst the government departments. I think you also saw in Alberta with the boom years you saw a case of a number of departments that were given mandates, and by and large those mandates did not direct people to work together. I think you saw a lot of new departments that said hey, let's get going, we've got a job to do, and I think we got busy doing our own thing and forgot that we have got to work together. I think it is again that maturing process. I see a lot of change in attitudes, and it is again maybe a function of the economic climate of the province, I think you are going to see probably in the next year or so some formal mechanism set up to integrate and coordinate recreation.

We had at one time in this province a committee called the Alberta Coordination Recreation Committee, and Ted Dykstra and myself sat on it. But it was a rather broad group, we had cultural interests, we had 4-H interests, we saw that it could not be the appropriate mechanism. I think we see now the need for an outdoor-resource related coordinating committee, and again I think that view is being held by some senior administrators now.

The other mechanism we had, or have now is rather embryonic, and in the adolescent period, and struggling with all those normal things that adolescents struggle with, and that is our Integrated Management Planning Program, and again I think you're going to see, not tomorrow night or next Monday morning, but over time you're going to see that particular program being a real asset in terms of coordinating recreation.

MRS. GOODWIN: Mary Goodwin, and I just started and I forget what I am in -- Environmental Protection. This may come as a surprise to you that there is a person on this side

that is in favor of snowmobiling, and as a person who spends many years on snowmobiles in both British Columbia and Alberta, I want you to think about a little different point of view, and that is that in order to provide an area for snowmobiles, you don't have to make all these trails and have everything all so organized. It would be really nice to have a place, just an area where people can just go. Now, we live in the Priddis area and there is snowmobiles in what is now the Kananaskis Country for many years, and really enjoyed it. We took our own food, we didn't need a food service facility. We went on our own trails, and sometimes we had as many as 25 in our group, and frankly, as far as I am concerned you ruined the whole area. I mean, not everybody wants to be so organized, people want to go out and do their own thing, they don't have to be that organized. I think you are getting carried away, and just think about it a little bit when you are planning these areas. Not everybody wants it that way.

MR. ROGERS: I think we agree with you in terms of over-programming of people. Recreation by definition is supposed to be spontaneous and very personalized. In terms of snowmobiling, I have been down to their conference for the last five years, and the first year I went was right after a particular politician announced a 4,000 kilometer trail from Waterton to Grande Prairie, and everybody got so intent on building this one-way trail that we all forgot about the fact of who is going to use it, and the last two years there has been a totally different message received by government at that particular conference, and that is all we want is a guaranteed area. So we are looking now to the integrated management planning program rather than looking at formalized trails to designated areas where people can go and get that freedom, and that pursuit of their interest.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: I think the other thing in terms of providing private sector tourism in the province and ways that people can make money, snowmobilers do spend money, they are not like cross-country skiiers who are a little bit more tight-fisted I think in terms of what they spend. There is

nothing wrong with that, but we are looking for opportunities for the private sector where they can get involved. Things like providing motels, et cetera, food services, or repair services, or even overnight shelters, hostels are a good example of an excellent idea of what could be developed. And even if it's not a formal trail system, providing those opportunities with easy access to snowmobile areas I think is probably a valid opportunity.

DR. HACKLER: Jim Hackler, Science Advisory Committee. After the discussion last night, Donn Cline told me that those campsites in Kananaskis are designed by the Forestry Service, and I should ask Barry Rogers to comment on them. You did a little bit in your speech, but because of the shortage of money now, will we not do so much bulldozing and leave the campsites in a slightly more natural state when they are built?

MR. ROGERS: Donn gave me a hard time at breakfast with that, and it is very interesting the way the Forest Service operates versus provincial parks is totally different. Most of our planning and construction is done by field people, and I guess the strength and weaknesses in our program delivery depends on what forest options you have, and we are pretty new in the auto access campground business, and we have got some real disasters. But I'll tell you, if you want to go on a trip with me this spring I can show you some really fine auto access campgrounds we built, and it is very interesting about the fire comment, and the reason those culverts are so long you are supposed to fill them half up with gravel to have a mineral soil base, but some of our guys forget to do that, and I couldn't understand their paranoia that they didn't do that. But they don't work if you don't fill them up, so you were rather accurate about that.

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: We have time for the last two speakers at the microphone.

MS. HEDENSTROM: Joanne Hedenstrom from Pollution

Study Group. I want to ask a question of both Mr. Rogers and Ms. Bloomfield, and both of them have to do, I think to the extent that things are imposed upon us by parks and planning people in Alberta, to what extent is that extent imposed upon them to do some of their own planning and initiate some of their own planning. But for Mr. Rogers, it seems to me that you mentioned there is only so many sites where you can provide recreation, you can't have everything, but when you talk about regulating recreation I had a very, I think, startling experience in the Beaver Mines area, I was being toured by someone who lives in the Castle watershed, a snowmobile tour to see the logged out areas there, and we were on a road to Beaver Mines campground, and a third of the Beaver Mines campground, which is a 200 percent used campground, has been clear cut, picnic tables out on a bald clear cut area, that sort of thing. And I was told that even though the logging companies had clear cut that campground, if we were found in a snowmobile on that road to the campground we would be given a fine. The local operator told me that he can't tether a horse to a tree because it's not allowed, he might be leaving a mark on the tree, and yet in the Castle watershed area we all know there is a huge, huge area of clear cutting going on and we had a real concern for the watershed. So I think I am less worried about the regulations on humans than I am on regulations about logging, it seems fairly unrestrictive.

When you talk about a government coordinating committee, that's great, but you again didn't mention public input. It is all very well and fine to have civil servants talking to each other, but for heaven's sakes give us a way to get in there. Because when you don't give us a way to get in there, and when you come up with public meetings you get confrontation, you get upset people. If we have access to our government then we have a far more sane process where we can give some input. And I have somewhat of the same thrust for Ms. Bloomfield, when your planning departments have

public hearings and some of them the public walk into a room filled with large room dividers covered with maps and plans that are already achieved, and some poor little citizen comes in there and you show him this is what we are planning to do, and it is really overwhelming and you haven't allowed for the public to sort of be in on the initial thrust. I think that's more of an information meeting, I don't think that is really a public hearing. If you want to have real public hearings, then you have to do really imaginative advertising thrusts. For instance, before you are going to have a public hearing, like two or three months before, you start advertising, and then a month before, or a few weeks before you send people into the community to get on talk shows and to be interviewed on TV and really raise public awareness so that you actually get the public to your hearing. Because I know any number of people who you could tell about public hearings because they are not aware of it, and this also increases frustration I really think, all the way around. So obviously we have to have better public input process, and you might want to comment on it, thank you.

MR. ROGERS: I will take your site specific problem first. I think the Forest Service, if you sort of think back to my earlier part of my talk about gaining wisdom in the last 50 years, and I think we will acknowledge that perhaps our cutting practices 20 or 30 years ago, especially in the Castle area are a problem. I think we have learned from some of our clear cutting practices, and I think you have to in terms of your snowmobile ride in that particular area, it's unfortunate you went there the year before when that campground was totally inundated with pine beetles. You know, we had to close that campground because it was a rather dangerous firetrap. I agree that particular campground does not appear to be very aesthetically pleasing. We have done a major underplanning program in that particular locale, that whole area in the south has something that Bruce didn't talk about today in Waterton about the pine needle problem, so

that is the reason that particular campground was cut: It was cut to attack the beetle, not necessarily a commercial cut.

A couple of your points about public participation and greater involvement of user groups again in the planning process and in recreation coordination. I just pull out the last two pages of my talk, it's very interesting when you speak you often wonder if people listen, or perhaps I speak too quickly. But I did make two points that my third objective was less government and more involvement of user groups as a key point in terms of a future objective in terms of recreation and coordination in the province. I also pointed out the need for not only government user group interaction, but also interaction between user groups. It is very difficult, I think you have to recognize the fact that civil servants have certain limitations, and a lot of these decisions to create public participation programs is a government decision, and we can work from our end, but I think it behooves you to work from your end, you are the people that elects the government.

MS. HEDENSTROM: I would like to make just a couple of short points. You spoke initiating user groups as though it was our fault that we haven't been involved, and I can assure you there is any number of groups begging to be involved. About the logging in the Castle watershed, it wasn't 30 or 40 we are worried about, it is right now, and the whole pine bark beetle excuse is a very controversial issue. If you had solicited input into that logging I think you would have a much more valid comment to make about the logging in the area, it is the present logging that is the problem.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: In your comments regarding the public participation program and Travel Alberta, I think you have a few misconceptions, number one, we don't hold public hearings.

MS. HEDENSTROM: But you call them public hearings.

MS. BLOOMFIELD: No, we don't, I didn't say we had

public hearings, I said we had public open houses and workshops. We have public open houses and workshops following release of our inventory reports, there is wide distribution of the report, we have a mailing list that is quite extensive including Chambers of Commerce, local interest groups, councils, mayors, Economic Development Committees, individuals who have been identified by the consultants during the studies. There is a wide mailing list of those reports, there is wide advertising in local papers, wide public sector broadcasting on radio stations, et ceters. The biggest problem we find in the open house phase is when you walk into the room there is panels displaying some of the information from the inventory, it is not a pre-determined plan whatsoever. The information is there, we just can't get the people to come in and even say lookit, you have already determined what the plan is. The intent, as advertised, is come in and share your views and ideas, and we find if we don't have a controversial issue we don't get people to come out.

The workshop phase we get more because we hand pick, I guess, people to come, we say please come to this meeting, we know you are interested, you have expressed interest in the past. This is what we have come up with, with your input we want to review it and see if this is the track we should be going on. We get better input at that stage.

We get good input as well in specific feasibility studies, we have public meetings prior to completion of the study, particularly if it's controversial issues. We were doing a four season resort study in Cold Lake, and people didn't want to see the four season resort study going in a few miles away from the Town of Cold Lake, we had a great turnout in terms of reacting to a specific issue. I guess the concern we have with government people is we would love to have your input in terms of planning for tourism, planning for recreation, planning for all sorts of things in the province, but it is very difficult to get people to come out

unless there is something they can react to that is going to negatively impact them right now. We can't get pro-active input from the public, we only get negative reactions. We try as best we can, and I don't know what more we can do besides going out and sitting down one on one with everybody. We go out on requests to the Chamber of Commerce, to councils, et cetera, but I think it is up to you to a certain extent as well.

DR. SWINNERTON: Guy Swinnerton, Environment Protection Study Group. The comment I want to make no doubt reflects my long experience with the British National Parks System in Britain, and from my own experience I see at some point in time you have to move towards a much more holistic approach to the provision of outdoor recreation, conservation, open space system. Wherein national and provincial parks are the high points in a much broader approach to recreation and conservation provisions. Obviously, I think, we have in Alberta at the present time an agency, and not least Barry's recreation Forest Service with regard to the Green Zone. My main concern is what happens with the White Areas, because that is the area where we really have the most comprehensive problems in terms of land use, where we have a multiplicity of agencies and interest groups, and yet we are probably least well equipped to be able to deal with that issue in that area. I suppose the question I am going to raise is really directed to Bill Shaw because to a large extent I foresee that the Regional Planning Commissions are probably in the best position to approach this problem and have an informed coordinating role in this regard, and certainly in the case of the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission, I think Bill Shaw and his colleagues should be complimented on the amount of work they have done in this area, I think they set a very good example for other Regional Planning Commissions in Alberta. My concern, however, is that following the directive from the Municipal Affairs in the last year in terms of

emphasizing those regional plans are advisory, I might ask Bill how strong he feels the role of Regional Planning Commissions can play in directing us towards a comprehensive recreational open space system in the White Area?

MR. SHAW: I would like to thank you very much for your compliment, do you want to forward it to the Alberta Planning Board, they are trimming our budgets. We haven't been getting too many compliments lately. I would like to think the Regional Planning Commissions do have a role, but it is certainly under the current feelings of the province with respect to local autonomy and with respect to many municipalities that are in effect seeking local autonomy that they wouldn't see the Regional Planning Commissions lording it over them with respect to various things. I continue to foresee for the next little while that we will try to be pushers and shakers and motivators and hope that we can draw more and more people together in that respect. We are only one Commission of many, our reality, to be perfectly honest, is that recreation is not one of the top priorities in our Regional Planning Commission area, for example, it may be the other things. It may spring up in the next three or four years. It was a key issue when we were under great pressure for our lake shores and it was filtering over to our river valleys with respect to the Red Deer River and the Eastern Slopes. But the Commission members felt they met that front on and turned to other things. I personally have a great interest in recreation, I hope they continue to turn back, but they are my masters, you know, let's say politically, and one thing I can say is that at times I am amazed at how undersupplied central Alberta is in the way of recreation. Certain actions have been undertaken to meet that, but with respect to our population accessibility, we are really ignored vis-a-vis other sections of the province. We would have to lobby in that respect. It is a question of collectively drawing people together and placing some priority on it. I think the Commission, though, does agree,

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON
(Question Period)

and one of their major emphasis is we are lucky we got a $20,000,000 urban park that will be a tremendous heritage for all time. We are not necessarily pressing for that, let's make sure that we do maintain our agricultural land, our expensive river valleys and our lake shores and our other very important resources so that each and every person in the future can share and enjoy.

MR. FAUSER: Horst Fauser, Non-Renewable Resources. I have two short questions, one does Ms. Bloomfield, as I watched your slide presentation and all the pictures of what tourists might come here for to do, I missed hunting. Was that an oversight only?

MS. BLOOMFIELD: That was only a partial list, it wasn't a complete list.

MR. FAUSER: All right then, thank you, I appreciate that you placed some emphasis on hunting. And Mr. Rogers, recognizing that the lumber industry now takes over from wildlife habitat, white tails now establish themselves in cutblocks very well, and I would like to ask you when will your department in cooperation with Fish and Wildlife implement seeding to cutblocks with grasses for wildlife which would then encourage wildlife production in the interim until new forest growth has established itself.

MR. ROGERS: I guess we look at cutblock regeneration that is quite different than when we look at rehabilitation of well sites and old roads. I think it is common practice when we go into the well sites or roads that we try to rehabilitate it to the native grasses and native shrubs. Unfortunately, we probably don't take an integrated broader thinking approach to cutblocks, I guess because it was a result of logging, a result of taking away the fiber, we tend to revegetate it with some future fiber. That is a very good point, and we do have my colleagues from Fish and Wildlife, so perhaps we should be looking at grasses as well as trees in terms of cutblock rehabilitation.

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: Will you join me in thanking the panel.

CHAIRMAN WOOD

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN DALTON: We will have a refreshment break now and reconvene at a quarter to 4:00.

(REFRESHMENT BREAK)

CHAIRMAN WOOD: For those of you who don't know me, I am Charlie Wood of the Renewable Resources Study Group. It is my pleasure to introduce you to the panel for this afternoon's session. On my immediate left is Ted Dykstra, Senior Regional Planner, Planning Division of Alberta Environment. He comes to us from the Netherlands, which probably means he has a greater appreciation for what we have than those of us who are born here and take it for granted. He attended public school in the Edmonton area, has a B.A. in geography from Central College in Iowa, and a Masters in geography from the University of Alberta. His employment in the early 1960's with the Canada Land Inventory, 1969 and 1973 the Municipal Affairs, 1973/74 the Battle River Planning Commission, and 1974 to the present with the Planning Division of Alberta Environment.

His responsibilities as the Senior Regional Planner has been in charge of preparing concept plans for Alberta Environment as well as investigating possible land use management options for shore lines and reservoirs owned and operated by the department.

Second on my left is Glen Clements, a public access management officer with the Fish and Wildlife Division. He attended the Saskatchewan Institute of Arts and Science in Saskatoon where he received a renewable resources management diploma, and before that, he attended the high school system in Regina. He has worked as the fisheries public access management officer from November 1st, 1981, when the program was started till the present time. He is responsible for coordinating and implementing the program. Previous to this, he worked as the Edmonton regional fisheries technician responsible for implementing all field programs for the region. In 1974 he worked as provincial fisheries research

technician responsible for implementing field research projects.

In 1973 he worked for the Freshwater Fisheries Institute in Winnipeg on freshwater research projects. Prior to that, when he was a student, he worked in reclamation as a reclamation technician for Kaiser Resources in Sparwood, B.C.

Next to him is Elmer Kure, who most of us have known for a very long time. Elmer lives in the Dickson Dam area, has farmed there for 30 years, has a family of three grown children, and has been active in a great number of things; and when Elmer says he has been active, he has been active. If his other activities bear any resemblance to his participation in the Public Advisory Committee, then he has been an extremely busy person.

He farmed, as I said, for 30 years in the Dickson area, served on the Canadian Grain Standards Committee, and the Committee of the Canadian Council for Development. He has been an active member of the Alberta Fish and Game Association, a past president of the Association and has been employed as an environmental and public relations director for the past ten years. He has served on numerous provincial government committees on commercial fishing, game advisory, environment assessment reviews, wilderness area reviews, outfitting area reviews, Livestock Loss Committee, Dickson Dam Advisory and Shore Line Planning Committee, and the Public Advisory Committee.

Finally, Cliff Lacey, the head of Outdoor Recreation in the Sports Facility Section for Alberta Recreation and Parks. He graduated with a B.A. from the University of Alberta in 1975 in recreational administration. He has worked for the Alberta Forest Service for 16 months as a forestry recreation planner for the Rocky, Clearwater and Whitecourt, Slave Lake and Grande Prairie forests. He worked for the Alberta Parks for five years as regional park planner, park master planner for Parks in the Lac La Biche,

Cold Lake and Fort McMurray areas. Currently he is manager of the Urban Park program in the Outdoor Recreation and Sports Facilities Section of the Recreation Development Department, where he provides general consultation services to communities, service clubs, public organizations in the province in the construction of trails, playgrounds, campgrounds, picnic areas and playing fields. Ted?

MR. DYKSTRA: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, first of all I would like to thank the planning committee of this conference for having invited me to come here this afternoon to speak to you. I truly appreciate the opportunity you have given me and my department, and I trust that my presentation will be informative and stimulating.

Secondly, I was rather pleased to see the seating arrangements here for this presentation. I was a bit worried that the same thing would happen to me as happened to the pastor I was told about not too long ago, a young fellow just out of the seminary who had been asked to speak to a local rural congregation. He was considering it a call and he was rather nervous and he got on this sort of elevated pulpit above the congregation, and he really wanted to make a good impression because this was his first job. He began by saying, "Behold, I cometh", and he didn't feel it had enough guts to it, so he said, "Behold, I come unto you". No, that didn't seem right either, so this time he leaned forward on the pulpit and said, "Behold, I cometh unto you". By this time he fell over, landed in this lady's lap, looked at her and said, "I'm sorry, ma'am." The lady said, "That's all right, you warned me three times". At least that won't happen to me today.

I have entitled my presentation "Some Problems, Issues and Possible Solutions to Water Based Recreation on Reservoirs in Alberta." The Department of Environment, as the agency responsible for water based resource planning and management in Alberta is becoming concerned at the

indiscriminate recreational use of land adjacent to reservoirs that could have serious, negative implications on the allocation, use and allotment of water resources in the province, both now and in the future. The construction of reservoirs is a mutual component of the total water resources planning function and distribution system in the province. It is therefore very important to recognize that reservoirs are quite different from natural lakes. Reservoirs are artificially created, legally surveyed manmade bodies of water constructed for one or more specific water resource management functions.

Reservoirs collect and store water for use, it could be irrigation, stock watering, flow augmentation, hydro-electric power or protection such as flood control of a particular community or region.

In Alberta there are basically five main agencies that operate and manage reservoirs. Alberta Environment, the Irrigation Districts, municipalities, private companies and Ducks Unlimited. There are also numerous small reservoirs owned by private landowners or even other government agencies. Now this slide is a trick slide showing some of the distribution of reservoirs in the province. It doesn't include the Ducks Unlimited reservoirs, because if we had added a lot of reservoirs it would have really complicated the picture. As you can see, most of the reservoirs are down south, the southeast, southwest corner of the province.

Now, an important component of all water resource projects, including reservoirs, is the need of the operating agency to purchase sufficient land, not only for the water storage aspect of the reservoir, also for related aspects such as borrow pits, location of access roads, spillage handles and erosion protection and so on. This means that reservoirs are generally surrounded by a strip of land, probably referred to as a right-of-way.

Because management agencies, whether public or private, are generally cost conscious, they purchase only the minimum amount of land required for the operation and maintenance of the reservoir facility. Consequently, reservoirs right-of-ways are usually narrow strips of land only a few meters in width and provide adequate width for access by operation and maintenance staff or for the protection against erosion. This is a rough slide of the Dickson Reservoir that you already saw in Bill's presentation, and I just quickly did that to show you that reservoir right-of-ways are very narrow stripe and I have shown them with that sort of dotted right-of-way line, the right-of-way goes around the whole reservoir. But the Green Area of the Crown land that was bought either for recreational purposes in this case, or for protection of the banks and below the dam. And there is also some Crown land shown there that really isn't part of the reservoir, that either existed prior to the reservoir being established or was bought and leased back to private landowners for grazing or other agricultural purposes. So there is more Crown land here than is typical for most reservoirs.

This here is another example of a narrow right-of-way north of Calgary near Standard.

So generally speaking then, the right-of-ways around reservoirs are not sufficient, don't provide sufficient land for recreational purposes because they are so narrow. Now, the current departmental policy or position regarding public use of its reservoirs is based on the underlying principle that impoundments and conveyance facilities associated with water resource projects shall be of a multi-purpose nature and must consider the requirement of all resource users, including recreation.

Reservoirs in Alberta have always been subject to a certain amount of local development in the development of recreational facilities along the shorelines. Most of this interest has come from service organizations, special interest groups and government agencies such as municipal and

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

provincial. Examples include the Lions Club Park on Travers Reservoir, the Cardston Rod & Gun Club facilities on St. Mary Reservoir, the municipal parks at Keho Lake, Rattlesnake Reservoir and the provincial parks on Travers Reservoir, Lake Newell and Park Lake.

This is the municipal park, County of Lethbridge on Keho Lake. This is the Cardston Rod & Gun Club facility on St. Mary Reservoir below the dam, and this is about an eight year old slide of Travers Reservoir, the provincial park on your right.

A number of private facilities have also been developed adjacent to reservoirs. Extensive summer cottage development has taken place in Chestermere Lake, as most of you people are familiar with, other cottage developments have been developed on Lake Newell, the Travers Reservoir, this one you see right here adjacent to the provincial park, as well as both clubs such as this one on St. Mary, a sailboat club, and this is the Cardston Boat Club, the entrance to it. As you can see, it's private, "Members Only", as well as church camps such as the Southern Alberta Bible Camp on Travers Reservoir, which was built last year.

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in the public demand to use the Crown land that is within the right-of-way for recreational purposes, particularly as a base for water based recreation. This is particularly true in southern Alberta where there is a lack of natural water bodies available to the public. This increased demand for recreation and related problems that come with it have placed considerable pressure on Alberta Environment as well as the other management agencies such as Irrigation Districts to provide the appropriate recreational facilities within those rights-of-way for use by the public. As a result of this, a number of programs have been developed, or have come to the forefront. The first of these programs, and the one that I am most familiar with, and that was mentioned by the Chairman in the introduction, I am a member of the

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

Alberta Environment Site Development Program. Now the purpose of this program is really threefold. The first major purpose is to reclaim and restore provincial water resource management projects, particularly construction sites to near natural conditions, to improve the aesthetic appearance of the site.

One of the things that I have been involved with in the last three years with Pat Seymour, who is sitting on the top level here, with the Devonian Botanical Gardens. We hired the Devonian Botanical Gardens to develop a study for us on natural grasses and wild flowers in Alberta that we could use for seeding some of these sites and reclaiming the sites, restoring them to near natural conditions with the existing natural vegetation. I think it was a very worthwhile program and it has got quite a bit of circulation in terms of worldwide input.

The second purpose of the program is to improve the multi-purpose uses of our reservoir, and this will include wildlife habitat, it could include ecological protection if there is such a particular need for a particular reservoir, or landscaping that could prevent erosional problems.

Then thirdly, and this is the aspect of the program related more to recreation, is to provide minimal public facilities in order to protect and prevent the degradation of the shoreline, that is to protect the reservoir for the primary purpose for which it was created. Under the program, reservoir shore lands are evaluated to determine suitable solutions to the problems resulting from site development and site degradation. And what we do is we hire consultants to prepare concept plans. Here is a typical concept plan initially done for the Dickson Reservoir Study, the recreation component of it, showing overall suitability for recreation on the reservoir. This is a more detailed site plan of the provincial park on the north side of the reservoir showing potential beach areas, roadways and this type of thing.

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

Similar situation on Severn Creek Reservoir, and in this case we had two alternatives, we looked at the first alternative and the second alternative and we were dealing primarily with a parcel of land on the top of the screen there that is owned by a county and then come up with a sort of a combined acceptable alternative for that area. Actually some sites are basically cleaned up because they are not big enough or suitable enough for recreation development, so they are cleaned up and we restore them and others, as these pictures show, are developed for recreation. This includes landscaping, facility development such as picnic tables, toilets, garbage receptacles, fire pits, this type of thing, fencing, installation of boat launches if appropriate. The development of beach and swimming areas. And I have got a few slides here that show you the typical area that we have. This is one on the Little Bow Reservoir, and the same site a couple of years earlier.

This happens to be the Waterton Reservoir. We took over a site that was owned by the Indians at Cardston and the M.D. of Pincher Creek, they gave it back to us for a dollar and we developed it. A typical boat launch, this type by the way is now operated by the county under this area recreation feasibility program which I will talk about a little bit later.

Some of our wildlife habitat areas, these are Canada geese on the Little Bow Reservoir nesting land, and this is the same reservoir.

At the present time, we have prepared some 22 reports. We have looked at or identified some 42 possible sites that could be developed and have implemented 20 sites. So 20 sites are now presently in operation.

Now you may have noted that I said Alberta Environment only provides day use facilities. So this is a conscious effort on the part of the department not to infringe upon the mandate of Alberta Recreation and Parks. Alberta Environment is not in the recreation business, and therefore

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

we have no desire to duplicate the park system. Consequently, the department on its own initiative has applied a number of restrictions to its program. These restrictions prohibit the department from purchasing additional land to expand on the existing resource base. As you recall, most of the land we have is very narrow and not very suitable for recreation in most cases. We can not expand that, we would be getting into the park business.

Secondly we also try to discourage overnight camping by refraining from providing water and electric power.

The site development program has proved to be quite successful, and has been able to meet certain basic needs on our reservoirs. Unfortunately we can not accommodate the increasing public demand for recreation facilities within the limited land base that we have. Furthermore, in spite of our restrictions with respect to overnight camping, there is a latent demand that seems to be unmet for camping on reservoirs, and I will show you some examples.

What we do basically is we have a little parking lot that people can pull a car in and we have lots of picnic tables. We have our beach areas fenced off. This particular fellow has driven right through a snow fence we put up and decided to camp on the beach anyway. These are the sites in Cold Lake near Wetaskiwin, obviously people aren't there for day use.

This is the Blood Indian Reservoir at the long weekend in May this year, some 1200 people were there according to our survey. So camping is a problem.

Now in addition to public use, and in addition to our program, a number of other government agencies have also noted the increasing demand for recreational reservoirs. Alberta Recreation and Parks has expressed, at least peripherally, interest in establishing new provincial parks at several existing reservoirs, both Payne Lake and McGregor Reservoir, as well as at new reservoirs, this is Dickson and Paddle River, as well as expanding existing facilities on

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

Travers Reservoir in Park Lake. Furthermore, Alberta Recreation and Parks is also trying to meet the public need for basic recreation facilities by providing financial assistance to municipalities through this Alberta Government recreation facility program, which is to give the municipality $100,000 capital grant and a $20,000 operating grant each year. A number of these sites have been developed on reservoirs, namely Milk River Ridge, Rattlesnake, as well as on some of the regulated lakes such as Burnstick Lake southwest of Red Deer.

And then another program that Glen Clements will be dealing with a little bit later, the Fish and Wildlife Division's program called "fisheries public access program", which basically provides day use facilities at water bodies that support fishery capabilities. That basically deals with the public recreation aspect.

Another major concern that we have as a department has been the dramatic increase in the last few years for requests, inquiries, and suggestions for development of private and commercial development on reservoirs. Both on patented lands as well as public lands. These proposals have included things like private campgrounds, the church camp facilities, cottage and country residential development, some including golf courses and riding stables, as well as hotel and motel complexes and resort facilities. There are indications that the pressure for recreation on reservoirs will continue to increase over the next several years, particularly in southern Alberta where there is a lack of natural resources, and as natural as the number of suitable sites to available water bodies seems to be climbing as well.

This increase in demand for more public and private recreation facilities on reservoirs has already created a number of problems for the various agencies such as Alberta Environment, Irrigation Districts, municipalities, private companies such as TransAlta and Alberta Power to manage reservoirs.

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

And similar problems are experienced in other parts of Canada and the United States as well, and no matter where you go, what agency you talk to, there seems to be four major problems. The first, the public pressure to limit the magnitude and/or the frequency of water drawdown in reservoirs, and let me give you some examples. This is Keho Lake. Keho Lake is an irrigation reservoir in the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District. It is rather a spoon-shaped and bow-shaped and very shallow. This is taken September 1st of this year, and it shows roughly where the water should be near the rocks and where it is at this particular time. There is a considerable amount of drawdown. The municipal park I'm talking about is just off to your right, and this is actually the boat launch right here.

Here you have a boat launch, you can't use it. This is actually on Green Mountain Reservoir in Colorado.

That is St. Mary Reservoir in 1977, this had sailboats as I showed you before, and they have a bit of difficulty trying to get to the water, about a 40-foot drawdown right there. So there is a difficulty because of irrigation demand on water, or other demands as the case may be, to regulate the water for recreation at the same time. And once you have the facilities developed on a reservoir, the existing interest groups and people that have invested in them will place demands on the irrigation requirements to reduce those requirements. Perhaps the best example is this at Chestermere Lake near Calgary. This is actually an irrigation reservoir owned and operated by the W.I.D., Western Irrigation District. And through a quirk of fate, I guess, they have constructed some cottages on it many, many years ago, they have cottages as well as $300,000 homes sitting there. Whenever the agency wants to draw down the water for irrigation downstream, a tremendous scream goes up that people can't launch their boats. As you see they have a lot of boat docks and piers going into the water. So, for all intents and purposes, this reservoir is used for

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

irrigation, we are trying to avoid that, and that is a major problem.

Secondly, there is an increasing operation and maintenance process involved with vandalism, particularly if you get involved in public recreation aspects, with vandalism, litter, rowdyism, public safety, habitat protection and some of those we discussed earlier. Here are some examples. That is Milo campsite on the McGregor Reservoir. That is a site at the Travers Reservoir, it appears we didn't provide enough firewood so they pulled up the existing vegetation to burn and vandalized. One of our warning signs near Jensen Reservoir, there are a few bullet holes and axe holes in it. Those are former toilets that belonged to the M.D. of Cardston and the M.D. of Pincher Creek in Waterton, they have simply been removed, and you will note that there are even holes in the roof.

So there is a tremendous amount of vandalism that you have to deal with when you start operating facilities.

Thirdly, there is a conflict in the water uses. This conflict is sometimes between farmers and recreation users. This is at Payne Lake just in time for the morning cattle watering. The cattle also graze the trees and do a few other things to the site that doesn't make it too amenable for recreational use.

There are other conflicts as well between boaters and board sailers, cottagers and day users, and I have shown some different activities at some reservoirs. Now these are taken in the States, this is Folsom Reservoir in northern California near Sacramento early in the morning, about 10 o'clock in the morning a few years ago. This is the same reservoir, the beach that they have developed, swimming areas separate from the boating area. This is Horsetooth Reservoir in Colorado just northwest of Denver. This is also Horsetooth Reservoir, there's a tremendous amount of country residential development there on both sides and they have problems with dumping their sewage into the reservoir, and

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

they also get their water supply from the reservoir at the same time.

This is a boat dock on the Horsetooth Reservoir, and as you note there is not too much flat land available for development, and this is a private club again. This is the type of thing you also get when you get involved with tourism, motels and cocktail lounges. This is Grandview Reservoir by Grand National Park in Colorado.

Fourthly, there is the problem of public access, and this problem directly relates to the aspect I was telling you before about the limited availability and suitability of publicly owned shoreline, in other words, a narrow shoreline. And this has been the problem in the States as well. The next three slides will show you what can happen. This is a lake in northern California near Sacramento as well, and it was constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and they own the shoreline. Now they too were not in the recreation business, so they said to the local council, we don't want to operate this camp, perhaps you can do it. Council said sure, this is back in the '50's. They took over the reservoir shoreline, and after about a year or two decided they didn't have the capability or the manpower to operate it effectively. So they decided that they were going to let leases up to private resorts. There is seven of these resorts on the reservoir, this is one, that's another, there is even step development, tier development on the reservoir as well. The result is that there was very little shoreline available for the public so they have to use the roadway. You can see the lifeguard sitting in the middle of the roadway sunbathing on the road. So as a result, now the Department of the Interior is once again taking over management of the reservoir and these are public facilities.

Now, as well the secondary problems, and one of those is the legal implications of public safety around water resource structures such as spillways, weirs, dam sites, et cetera. This is the Travers Reservoir inlet where the water comes in

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

to the Travers or McGregor Reservoir. As you can see, the sign says "Dangerous Structure - Keep Away". This is the same spillway, you can see people right at the bottom fishing. Now this is not bad, I have seen people throw picnic tables in the water near the bottom of that spillway and stand on them to go fishing. Now those who live in Calgary know the Bow River weir and the number of deaths on that weir, and just this summer some of Glen's colleagues drowned on the Bow River canal system near the McGregor Reservoir. These structures are very dangerous. So there are implications to the department about public safety and you can be sued.

Secondly there are also public pressure to management agencies such as ourselves to provide more urban services - paved roads, water and power, garbage collection on a regular basis, this type of thing. This is not really a very good slide, but this is a reservoir near Caspar, Wyoming, and towards the right you will see a number of mobile homes. Initially these were just part of the campgrounds, and now they pretty well lease those sites from May to September or October, and a completely paved road system in there that the local county has to provide for them. That's a boat club on the right, private boat club as well. There is also country residential development off to your right, some $400,000 homes in there.

Then thirdly, there is interagency conflict, some of them alluded to this this morning, as well as this evening. For instance, I will give you a couple of examples. Alberta Environment is faced with the problem that Crown land within the right-of-ways I have described is administrated by the E.N.R., Energy and Natural Resources, Public Land Division Disposing Committee. We have no members on that committee, and there have been a number of decisions made in the past that we have not been informed on, and as a result facilities have been implemented that could affect our use of the reservoir. Now this happens to be a boat launch in Milo, crossing the existing facility there is a private boat

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

club, Milo Aquatic Club has leased this boat launch out so they can launch their boats on our facilities as well. So it completely wrecks our facility, and we really have no way of stopping them. It's a minor thing, but it does happen.

Secondly, and it affects Bill Shaw's area of land use management in the province is the responsibility of local municipalities and Regional Planning Commissions, and so our department has no direct input in preventing development on private land adjacent to reservoirs. And the example would be Bible camps that I showed you is perhaps a good example. That facility was built, and our department didn't know anything about it until it was well underway. The development officer approved development of the facility, and we had no input into it. Now I am not saying it's bad. But perhaps that facility should not be located on a reservoir, and I think we will get into the situation later with public land management, but that is one of the responsibilities that we have and the problems that we face that decisions are made that affect us, or could affect us in the future that we have no control over.

Now, what are the solutions to these problems? Well, one obvious solution is for Alberta Environment to play a more active role in the management of the reservoir shoreline. Although the department is aware that other agencies have legislative jurisdiction over the planning, regulation and control of both public and private land within the province, I think the department is coming to the point of view and is beginning to recognize that we have to take a more active role and more involvement in this area if it is to protect our mandate to deal with water resource management in the province.

Now, the department is presently trying to improve its communications with other government and municipal agencies in order to develop a more comprehensive management strategy that will assure our protection of our particular role, the control of public and private facilities on

reservoir shorelines. Some of the management options open to us, and we are considering some of these right now, although they are not department policy or government policy, they are just under consideration, are things like the title of all Crown lands be transferred to our department from E.N.R. That the preparation of reservoir area management plans for all existing and newly created reservoirs owned by the province prepare reservoir area management plans so that we can control development, protect our investments. That land acquired for future reservoirs should include areas that have land for recreation development as well as strictly the operation and maintenance of the reservoir. In other words, buy a bit more land than just the right-of-ways that we have now, select those areas suitable for recreation in conjunction with the reservoir.

Fourthly, permit private sector development on reservoirs strictly in terms of providing high quality recreation facilities and services on suitable locations at some of the reservoirs, particularly if there is a demand for that type of facility on that reservoir. This could be through a lease arrangement.

And then finally permit other government agencies such as Recreation, Parks, Tourism, whatever, to provide on a request basis facilities to them, and lands to them that we own so they can develop these facilities and operate them, but lease them from us. And I will show you some slides right now of some of the facilities in the States. That is a marina on Horsetooth Reservoir in Colorado, it is a private facility leased for a five year period with a five year option. Now this was two years ago, they may have changed those lease arrangements now. This is a marina on Folsom Reservoir in California, and this is a boat launch area on Folsom Reservoir. The interesting part is that the Bureau of Reclamation that operates the reservoir has different policies for different parts of the country, because in California this type of asphalt is allowed in California, in

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Dykstra)

Colorado it is not because it is a chemical compound. There is an oil base in the asphalt.

This is Pueblo Reservoir in Pueblo, Colorado, and it is designed for over a hundred foot drawdown. That boat launch you see in the middle of the slide is 300 feet long and about 55 or 60 feet wide. If you look closely it hides the water and at this point you can just see one ledge just in the middle of the picture. So it can go as high as the top of that boat launch, and that particular marina will float up and down with the water as it rises or lowers, and the facility is designed to do that, to accommodate that drawdown. As you can see, it is well used, the people from Denver lease the slips for the summer and come down on weekends.

This is also Pueblo Reservoir, and this is the State Park they were putting in two years ago. It was just an excellent facility and I wish I had more slides of the construction, it is well built and all based on solar energy. They have a little problem that we don't have here, they killed 25 rattlesnakes just the day before we got there as they were building the facility. I guess that is one thing that people like Barry and Glen don't have to worry about when they develop a park facility.

This is the the picnic site on Cherry Creek right in Denver. Cherry Creek is a controlled reservoir for the City of Denver, and as you notice, these are all concrete, and that is because in the spring there is about two or three creeks and this whole area is flooded. When the water drops down, it is just concrete, so there is no damage done. So it is designed to accommodate the restrictions of the reservoir operation.

This is Carter Lake which is just south of Horsetooth Reservoir, they are in the same system and when they built it they developed tier development, and this is the long weekend in May, their Memorial Day weekend, it is very heavily used. This is Jensen Reservoir,it's a really small reservoir in

northern California. It's a very pretty sight, and the gravel that you see there actually has been put in after the reservoir was constructed because they needed more land base to work with. They have a narrow shoreline right-of-way and they put a little marina in just around the bend. In order to get that marina in there and access to it they had to fill the reservoir partly to provide access.

Here you have some of our own designed facilities, this is St. Mary Reservoir, and this is the boat dock that we designed. That's where the reservoir was fairly full, the same boat dock and the water is drawn down about ten feet. This is a marina at Travers Reservoir at the local provincial park. It can accommodate some fluctuation of the water level. Here is an interesting situation, we have had some problems in tree planting program, so in order to be a bit more successful, particularly in the dry areas down south, we have put our trees in swails to catch the run-off from the snow in the spring as well as the summer, and the result has been fairly promising. This is the Little Bow recreation site at the Little Bow Reservoir.

These management options I have suggested are only suggestions at this time and they shouldn't be regarded as government policy. One thing we have done in the last couple of years is already establish some close working relationships with other government agencies, particularly Alberta Recreation and Parks, Fish and Wildlife, Energy and Natural Resources and Regional Planning Commissions. And I guess one of the best examples of this is something that Bill has alluded to, and that is the Dickson Reservoir area structure plant. The plan was prepared by the Commission at the request of the county in conjunction with Alberta Environment, Alberta Transportation, Recreation and Parks, and Alberta Agriculture, and I think those of us who got involved in the project really appreciated working together. What we have done is come up with a plan that is pretty well acceptable to all agencies involved. There is now a legal

document in the Planning Act that was adopted by the county in September which will help us protect our resources as well as give the county a legal document to work with in terms of dealing with land use problems in the area. And we are doing a very similar project now with the County of Lac Ste. Anne and the Yellowhead Regional Planning Commission in the Paddle River Reservoir area near Mayerthorpe.

This concludes my presentation, I trust that I have at least increased your understanding of some of the problems and issues related to the use of reservoirs for recreation. I want to thank you very much for your interest and your attention. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN WOOD: Thank you Ted, this is the aspect of environmental use that attracts my interest to the greatest extent. I could look at those slides and listen to those stories all day long, both the good and the bad, I like them all. Glen Clements then, please.

MR. CLEMENTS: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank the Public Advisory Committees of the E.C.A. for allowing us to give this presentation on the new fisheries public access programs. I would like to just basically give you a thumbnail sketch of the program, and then we'll go ahead and give you some slides. This morning Steve Kun opened up the meeting quite well showing us national parks, he talked about a very complicated system, very diversified. This afternoon Barry Rogers got into a program that again takes into a lot of consideration multiple use, and again it's scaled down, but a little less complicated. The nice thing about the fisheries access in this program is that it is seen as a single user, they have specific needs that over the past 30 years we have been stocking lakes or bodies of water, reservoirs, in the province. We haven't been able to get other people to basically come in and take over the facility development on these.

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Clements)

During the late '70's and early '80's Fish and Wildlife Division was hearing considerable public complaint regarding the lack of sanitary maintenance and poor undeveloped access at a number of existing stocked lakes. The division had been stocking lakes and following the policy that free public access had to be available before a lake could be stocked. Any undeveloped Crown land such as road allowance or other unoccupied Crown land was considered free access to meet the policy. Without the needed resources to provide sanitary and land surface management, these sites became overused, degraded and sanitary problems became unacceptable. A case in point is Lower Chain Lake which I had the personal commitment to create a fishery on and stock with rainbow trout, this is just north of Athabasca. Soon after the fisheries took off and the total landscape around the lake was destroyed by would-be anglers trying to find a place to park, and it was really very tough to watch this type of thing happen.

It was because of these numerous complaints and the lack of commitment on the part of other agencies to react to these specific problems that monies were approved in the '81 and '82 fisheries budget to develop a program that would provide managed public access sites to support fishing purposes. The program followed the guidelines set out in Fish and Wildlife outdoor recreation policy and was largely reactive to two major problems. It was for the provision of public access that had minimal or no interference with adjacent landowners and to provide sanitary maintenance in the form of toilets and garbage control.

The objective of the fisheries public access program is to provide bare essential access sites with garbage and sanitary maintenance and possibly boat launch facilities. This requires site designs for access and parking areas, toilets and garbage facilities, fencing and barrier construction, and site signage. It also requires the arrangement of reliable maintenance control. These sites are

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Clements)

not designed for picnicking, open fires or overnight camping. To that extent the program basically tries to develop areas that are used by the anglers for access only.

To accomplish this objective, three approaches have been established: to get another agency such as Parks, Forestry, Environment, counties, municipalities, M.D.'s to develop a site at their expense, and again corporations in the second phase with these agencies to develop sites on a cost sharing basis, or a basis that Fish and Wildlife provide the fundings and the other agency develops and maintains the site. Barry alluded to our program and so did Ted with Environment, and in both cases, the only way you can make our priority their priority is to help design and fund these sites. And in the final instance, Fish and Wildlife will develop and maintain the site.

Benefits from this program are: signed access where there is no question about the right of public access. Providing a site that is not a mud hole or subject to significant erosion through land that is basically road construction. Controlled vehicle damage to the surrounding lands through barrier construction. Providing sanitary and garbage facilities for clean acceptable public facilities, and to provide more efficient use of small access sites.

The first step taken in the program was an inventory of access facilities or lack of them at lakes stocked with trout as a basis for identifying the development required to stock lakes are very popular and receive heavy useage.

In addition, there are some outstanding sites on non-stocked lakes which have generated complaints about garbage, and which are included in the initial inventory. Presently our inventory has existed for approximately 275 stocked lakes, 28 native lakes that were added to it. Of those 300 sites we went through and had a look at the existing agencies which had development on them, Parks had 46, Environment 14, Transportation had developed approximately three, and other agencies such as counties and I.D.'s take care of about 26.

So we still have approximately 214 sites which could have been partially developed which need further development, or had no development on them at all, and we had to take them over.

Through my slide presentation, I will attempt to give you some insight into what the fisheries public access section has accomplished in the past two years.

This is Star Lake just outside of Edmonton. This first shot shows the intended signing for the program, which we hope you will see throughout the province. This is a shot of a site before development. You will notice the garbage around the site, and I have to explain to you that the site is so well used by people from Edmonton that it has been cleaned up twice this year already before we went into final development. They park right up to the shoreline, so it's pretty hard to prevent that.

This is the finished site, basically developed parking area, gravelled access, we have attempted through the barrier to prevent parking right along the shoreline. This is the same shoreline before we put the barriers and following the barriers the anglers seemed to use it quite well. That is the final facility that we put in and installed.

The next site, Mirror Reservoir, near Bashaw, Alberta, basically an old CN reservoir that is raised above the ground. They used to use it to fill up steam engines. And now we stock it with rainbow trout through the "Buck for Wildlife" program, the land purchased around the reservoir and the berms were rebuilt. Unfortunately before the site was actually put in, the berms were being knocked down by people trying to park on top. This is the site before we put the access facility in, you had to do it on one side of the reservoir and you see the backside of the reservoir, but that is the completed site. Around the backside of the reservoir this is what it looked like before construction, there was very little room for parking during the wet times.

There is a collection ditch in the back part there, and that was the access turned into a little further down. Here you see the top of the berm when they used it for parking and when it got muddy so the vegetation never really did establish.

Following development we put in parking, now basically a turnaround at the end of the road, and if you'll note the vegetation on the top of the berm has come back quite well.

Schuman Lake, this is a lake near Fort Assiniboine. There was an attempt by the Fish and Game, or a private club to put a facility in there, but unfortunately their garbage was just overwhelming. Earlier this year the Health Unit from Barrhead wrote us a note saying they were going to close the site to anglers because of the problem, so again we tried to react to this one fairly quickly and provide a basic facility, barrier off an area that they could use for day use, and harden up the access. There is the facility development, and this basically is the access down to the lake.

Kirbys Pond, another project set up through "Bucks for Wildlife". They purchased the land, unfortunately through the "Buck for Wildlife" system they do a lot to enhance the area with projects for wildlife, but are unable to supply facilities, and so we are called on to try and provide facilities at the site. This is just prior to the building of the access site, there was uncontrolled vehicle use of the area. This is the road going in prior to construction, lots of mud holes, and tough to get through. That is under construction. Unfortunately, we only have a picture here in the winter, that was the final barrier we put around to keep people from degrading the land around the lake. That is the final site.

This is another site out near Edson, another interested club had tried to supply facilities here at Miller Lake and the problem was all they had was the end of a road allowance for access to the lake, so they placed the outhouse on the edge of the road. That is the walk down to the lake, and at

this site through a subdivision process, the I.D. gained control of a municipal reserve, and we worked together on this project to basically stake it out. They owned a piece of land on the right-hand side of the roadway, provided again an access road, the parking lot is down at the far end near the water front, and put in a basic facility. It's hard to tell from this picture, but the eventuality is that they'll put in a camping facility at this site, but it was built for future expansion by the I.D.

This is another one down at Burns Lake in the Crowsnest Pass prior to construction. The land basically was controlled by the municipality or County of Pincher Creek, and they allowed us to work together on this project to provide the facility again. This is before the gravel was put in here, and the main intention of this was to provide some parking for berms, but also it's a tremendous access to the Crowsnest River for angling.

Another site down in that area, again a purchase by "Buck for Wildlife", they were unable to supply the facilities. This is prior to construction, and the inlet creek is fairly important to them on the right-hand side, so the site was developed that we could provide barriers and provide parking. Again we went down to take pictures this fall, and the only day we got there they had eight inches of snow, and it was gone the next day.

Another site which caused some grief to Fish and Wildlife, a large number of complaints. "Buck for Wildlife" again had provided a tremendous stream bank program in here to improve the brown trout fishing. They succeeded very well, there was no facilities at this site, and large complaints about no facilities, and so again we moved in, and as you can tell, this whole site was raised up in the air. All our facilities are holding tank pump-out systems, and hopefully this will prevent any contamination during high water in the flood plain. This is a bit of a success story for five government agencies, this spring Cow Lake rainbow trout

fishery there took off in an unprecedented manner, on June 8th there was a meeting of these five agencies, and on June 23rd I believe the site was finished. Prior to this it had a mud boat launch and parking for eight vehicles. The use was about 30 vehicles per day in here, and we provided some fish filleting tables, garbage bins, parking for about 36 vehicles; a well-accepted site.

This is basically what we had to contend with before, a lot of clubs had tried to address the problems that we have on reservoirs and ponds, and just with the vandalism and the facilities that they put in couldn't really handle the problems that cropped up, and this is what we hope to provide for people that use our lakes.

In summary, we have been involved in the development of approximately 15 sites for the past few years. The facilities right now are very minimal. We work with a lot of other agencies to try and put them in, and we hope that the demand, which basically is the complaints that we have logged over the past years, are enough to warrant this type of facility development. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN WOOD: Again, I use these facilities a great deal. It is interesting to see it from the other side through the problems that maybe I have caused, and I know other people have caused, and to see it from the other person's perspective. Where did Elmer go -- there he is.

MR. KURE: Ladies and gentlemen, I haven't got any props with me, and I think you have seen all the examples of problems and improvements that can be made where access is involved, particularly water based recreation. I suppose that we have become accustomed to the public viewpoint, you have had a pretty heavy dose of civil servants operating and telling you the systems as we have them all the way for the national parks down to your local lake. And I suppose that I got on this panel by someone suggesting that the public input and the grass roots outfit should be thrown in here for

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Kure)

good measure. I am here, and it is pretty easy because we have tended to be in a reacting situation most of our lives from the public viewpoint. It is still pretty apparent that coordinating government is a horrendous task. Some of us spend most of our time at that. We find it even more difficult to coordinate government than to coordinate the public. So I will just say a few things about that, because I think history should have taught us some lessons, and surely we have learned that no one can deal with public interest, the public sector without that element of public user groups.

Some of us that have hunted and fished all our lives are pretty close to that. We have seen the development of resources, we have seen it as the greatest encroachment on some of our best resources by development of all kinds, and tried to compete with development to the extent that we try very hard to maintain a viable wildlife resource around us, even though we pretty much occupy the land.

I suppose we could also say that we could look at history, and I would like to just go back, I don't want to belabor the complaint area at all, but I think historically we erred in a number of places, and we might as well know about them. In 1905 probably if we had been a little more, I suppose, futuristic in our thinking like the people were who set aside this park before the turn of the century. If we had used that kind of vision, then the beds and shores of water bodies would probably have been spelled out in our titled lands, and we wouldn't have near as much problems as we have today.

So that's an obvious error of history, but tradition has given us a number of other things besides problems, and traditionally everyone laid claim to their little piece of the universe, as we did here in Alberta, and that is giving us a great deal of heartburn to overcome those failures, I guess, of tradition for development to keep pace with what happened on our land. So our lakes, of course, became

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Kure)

encumbered with cottages wall to wall. Sylvan Lake in central Alberta is a good example, and Bill Shaw can tell you a great deal about lakeshore planning and the difficulties that he has experienced as a planner to get in there, and he takes a lot of flak from people when they go in and say we'd like you really to do something a little better than you're doing, quit running your sewers into the lake, you know, you should have just a little space here for the public use, and it is very difficult once you have sold all that land which we did quite casually in the past, not thinking of the importance of the public. It is really strange when you examine how well people look after their own property, and how poorly the public, agencies of government look after public property in many instances for us. There is really a large oversight, I think, on the part of government generally to foresee, although people do warn us all the time, they warn governments, and we have these great workshops on futuristic planning. But we are really slow to react.

So the big gap I think in terms of the level of government that needs to be put into perspective, if I can be so bold as to try, because we do have our federal and provincial local government structures and they are part of our life. But they almost always operate in an adversary environment to the detriment of good planning. Again some of us that have been around a couple of years, as Charlie said, can understand how difficult it is to get good planning with an adversarial system.

Those same agencies are famous for leaving the public sector and the user groups out, which after all are the group that we are doing all these things for. And it is really strange that it's taken someone years to recognize the user as an advisory resource, and how much money and time could be saved if we just went the proper route.

I would like to talk about water based recreation and access just a little bit too. The Bow River, you mentioned

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Kure)

Sylvan Lake as a classical example of a lake that has been completely developed privately around the lake, now I think the Bow River is probably another classic. In 1969 there was 90 road allowances leading to the Bow River that were closed illegally, and it is no credit, I guess, to the local administration, the municipality or M.D. or county, as we developed to those stages to allow landowners and ranchers the bold, I suppose, option that they felt they had, and that was to close off these things and keep their land private. Now certainly it's understood that it was done for their own protection in many cases, but also for their convenience to save building the fence both sides of the road allowance, to save a number of other things if they were running cattle and so on. But that had to come to a head, and we are getting an update today on that particular situation and the difficulty of going back and straightening out some of those terrible mistakes. We didn't realize apparently that the Bow River was a resource that belonged to the people of the province and they had a right to use it, and we closed off all the access to it simply because local authorities didn't act in their own jurisdiction in the right to protect the public demand rather simply to go along with the few, the landowners and ranchers.

Charlie said I farmed for 30 years, well I really share the concerns of landowners and farmers, but there comes a time when you've got to say what is right and what is wrong. It takes a long time to straighten these things out and people may well, 30 years, what are you doing, you come out and tell me that I've got to open up a road allowance, and who wants the public on their back doorstep anyway.

So there is obviously those difficulties that previous panel members haven't spent much time really sorting out. So we have trouble with private land as well as leased land, and I guess it's important that we talk about these things so we get the proper perspective.

I think the Regional Planning Commission probably have done more in the last few years to try and cope with the problems of preserving certain natural features, whether it be land or water based, within their regions, within a planning perspective. And it has been like pulling teeth, and I think they will admit that it has been tough not only to sell the need for environmental protection to local counties and the municipal authorities that they represent, but it is also difficult to sell these things to a provincial planning board that sets up their vetoes for planning regions. Now I know that we all need someone to look at our work and do a critique, but obviously some politicians take that role fairly lightly, and it's very difficult.

You saw on the screen a number of shots of the Dickson Reservoir, and because I was on the two committees that dealt with it in the first place they suggested the formation of a public citizens advisory committee, plainly by pulling teeth the Minister of Environment appointed the committee, and then that committee turned around and recognized the need for shoreline planning and recommended that. Well Ted didn't say much about the public end of it, but really it was the people in the region that developed that plan with the able assistance of planners like Bill and Ted here. But I think they are at least, we ended up with a proper document in fairly good time, they gave us just over a year for the shorelines plan that really met in the first instance, and I think this is important, the aspirations of the people that lived there around the lake as well as in the immediate region. So I think it may be in fact be a benchmark type system that other agencies of the government should look at very strongly as far as future reservoir or any other type of plans that has to do with public owned resources.

I would like to say just a word, Mr. Chairman, about the question of access, because we have had a very confusing situation in Alberta for some time as far as the interpretation of the word "access" to certain lines. We have got an unsatisfactory provincial rule as far as access

to private lands, and a very unsatisfactory interpretation of the right of access to public lands under certain lease dispositions. We think in the rewrite of the new Wildlife Act, which there is a working paper on it now and it's probably a document that we will clear up the access issue to private land. However, the question of access to leased land is still in the mill. And while there is a couple of A.D.M.'s looking at it and hopefully have been given a directive to come up with a resolution to that subject, we haven't seen it yet, and we're hoping shortly probably by the spring session we'll have the access to private and public lands in a clearly defined position as far as the provincial intent is concerned. Hopefully we will get that result, because we can't afford any more of this grey area as far as access to lands. It needs to be clearly spelled out just as the picture that these fellows have shown you makes it clear, you have got to have access for a lot of people to a lake, you have got to provide a clearly marked spot for that to occur or you're going to have I suppose ignorance, and really defined the rights of others by the public that really want to get at this resource. So there is no doubt room for a great deal of improvement there.

The forest lands issue I think Mr. Rogers dealt with it, he did say we have been dabbling in this recreation access, and I think maybe this is the problem really they have been dabbling in some of these issues for far too long without any clear distinction what is to be done and what is right and what is wrong.

How are we dealing with issues, well we are coming along, obviously the last couple of days we've had a chance to see that we really are coming along and there is some hope that we will resolve most of them eventually. So someone mentioned the North Saskatchewan River and the natural historic monument on the North Saskatchewan River at Rocky Mountain House, the threat to that national historic site by an operation of one industry upstream, the production of

power. It's not just a national park issue, I'm sure it has a lot of heartburn out there connected with supplying people with power in this province, and our hydro is practically all on a power demand basis which is really turning our rivers into a wasted resource from the point of recreation and use. So we've got a couple of hundred kilometers of North Saskatchewan River which are almost entirely almost without the value of use connected with it by the public year-round because of the peaking power situation. I hope that we will be able to turn that around and put our hydro site on a sustained yield in the next few years.

I am sure that many of you here are familiar with yo-yo action of our rivers, whether it be the Bow or the North Saskatchewan. What happens in rivers when we are calling for power and so on, and we have only drowned one person of that operation, I think, but there is a great deal of inconvenience, you can't boat on the river, you can't fish in safety, you can't cross them in the winter, you can't use those hundreds of kilometers of winter and summer corridors for recreation use because it has been used by one industry at their discretion, and that is obviously got to be turned around. However, dealing with the Bow, we are going to hear some more about it. We have heard some, but obviously we're trying to catch up from all this backlog of illegal closures sanctioned by local municipal government over the years, and I'd like to say how we resolved this in one instance, the county that I live in, Red Deer, we had to elect the council, and the County of Red Deer had to get some guts to change some policies of the municipal authority, it's as simple as that. And that was the only way we could get the county to look at the probability of adopting a policy of not leasing road allowances at the whim of one landowner. And so we now have a policy that no road allowances will be leased or considered for lease if they have an access value or habitat value or access to some stream or lake.

That has been turned around in the County of Red Deer,

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Kure)

they are leaders in that regard I think in this province. They are leaders in Red Deer for a lot of things, Bill Shaw has told you about the first planning region to deal with some of these issues, but also leading in the question of habitat retention pilot project in the County of Red Deer. So there are some examples of what the public can do cooperating with planners and municipal and provincial authorities, and so I am prepared to give you some examples, I think they are excellent examples of how you can do it if a few people set their minds to go and achieve it.

I guess the lease instrument, the leased lands coming to resolution may need to change the lease instrument to resolve that issue. I would like to, getting fairly close to conclusion of what I was going to say, Ted took so long I will have to cut mine short anyways.

There is a new forest development and new people who are civil servants don't see it, I would like to warn you of that there is a no development position being taken by a lot of people in Alberta today, and Tom Priddle, you don't need to go to Salt Spring Island to face up to that issue, because at the point that you get there they don't want any more people on Salt Spring Island and they are obviously not even prepared to put in a sewer system because they know it will attract people and development.

Now that same philosophy of no development is occurring at a fairly rapid rate in Alberta, particularly between Calgary and Edmonton west of Number 2 Highway. It is a heavy demand area, the area from the development corridor west to the east slopes. I think it is really a target area for a lot of people to live, get subdivisions to have a piece of countryside close to that quality that we are all trying to preserve. The demand in there is real, and obviously the people have moved in or lived in a rural scene, and there is more of them would like to get out there. But people in that region are beginning to take the position, whether they say it or not in public, we don't want any more development,

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Kure)

and Bill and Ted can see how that came through in the Dickson Reservoir plan. People said let's preserve the agricultural nature of this area, let's preserve the nature of the habitat for wildlife, let's keep development a low profile. That's what the plan intended to do, and hopefully it will follow through on that and not be upset by some decision made in Edmonton. That hopefully we will follow that pattern, and when development comes along we'll go back and talk to the people about it. The secret of success, I think, is that you don't hand down a plan from the top all the time, obviously we have got the experts in all these fields that we expect to do our planning for us, but many of them in the past have felt that their authority was to develop the plan and then come down and ask if it was all right. Obviously the local people can be of great assistance in that process if you start at the bottom before the plan is developed.

So I think we should take, or take heed at least, as I see it to a new force that is developing out there that says no more development, and I believe that we're going to have to look very strongly at our water management standards in this province, and we will probably have a chance in the next month to do that as well through the newly created Water Commission starts hearing some of the proposals for water management in the South Saskatchewan River Basin. I believe that we will start looking at some of those scenarios rather quickly, even before Christmas probably, and we will have a chance to respond to what we said a few months back and seeing how those ideas have reflected in those scenarios that may become water management plans.

It is obvious to some of us, and has been for some years that our standards for water quality in this province is not good enough. It is not serving us well, and it is not serving our neighbors to the east very well. The fact that we live at the head of the creek, I suppose, gives us a little freedom to do a lot of polluting. But I think it is to our discredit that we live at the head of the creek and then pass

the water down the river system in a form that is unfit for our neighbors. And we are obviously doing that with second stage sewage standards in this province. I don't think they can be depended on much longer, although Parks and Environment, as a matter of fact, have strongly defended Alberta water standards saying that they are the best in Canada, and that's good enough. But it is not good enough, and we are telling our municipal authorities all along the rivers that it is good enough, and that is exactly why they are not doing any better. Nobody in this province is going to put any sewage treatment facilities in any better than second degree treatment, naturally because it costs money. Local authorities would have to tax their taxpayers, and we have discussed this through our public advisory committee with the top people in the Department of Environment and challenged that position, and I think that we are right. If somebody thinks we are wrong, they should certainly let us know.

You heard it loud and clear when we talked about timber development in the Brazeau area, a timber plan was developed that a pulp mill might be part of that management plan. The City of Edmonton told us in no uncertain terms that there will be no pulp mills to go in on the North Saskatchewan River upstream from their city. It cost them a hundred million dollars, as a matter of fact, to put in a water treatment facility that would offset the pollution contributed by the pulp mill. Now we're not only running that river up and down like a yo-yo, we are also talking about putting a pulp mill up there. And while we have built certain structures to compensate for the pollution of Edmonton, like the Brazeau Dam, that was the purpose of that dam, to dillute the sewage for the City of Edmonton, so we can't really isolate for discussion water based recreation and access unless we talk seriously about some of those things. Because probably what we won't need access to is the Bow, the North Saskatchewan, the Red Deer and the Oldman

Rivers below Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary and Lethbridge unless we change our standards, because the water won't be fit for canoeing let alone catching fish; and that's the truth, that is a fact of life. So we have got a fair ways to go in this province yet, despite the great things that we have been doing in a small way.

We have some basic issues to resolve all the way from the access issue itself, opening some public access in places that have been completely closed off and to the question of standards that we're going to set down that will preserve the quality of water for future generations, our children and their children.

So I don't think we could take it lightly, I believe that the secret of this thing is no doubt by participatory democracy, and some of us have spent a great deal of time talking about that over the years, and I'd just like to say that public involvement is a serious matter and it can't be taken lightly either, and it shouldn't just be tokens. If you expect some help from the public out there, make them a part of the decision making process, and they will then respond, I think, in a responsible fashion. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN WOOD: Trust Elmer to tell it the way it is. I'm sorry, Ken has just told me that we have to be out of here by 6 o'clock.

MR. LACEY: Ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to be able to speak to you in what is rapidly becoming this evening. One of the advantages of being the last speaker is oftentimes some of the items that you wanted to discuss have already been mentioned by the previous speakers, and as a result the audience is sensitized to what you are going to talk about. One of the other advantages too is I know that the hunger pangs are starting to gnaw at you and that is going to keep you awake through my presentation.

I guess I am just another uncoordinated civil servant, as Elmer has typified us, there seems to be an awful lot of

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

us here parading our wares before you today, and I hope that I will be able to fit what I'm going to speak to a little more into the theme that we are asked to address, and that is the significance of water, rivers and lakes in Alberta. I am responsible for the urban parks program, in a sense I am responsible for it, I manage a grant program, that means that in one instance I might be big brother to one of the communities who is a recipient of our grant, and in another instance I might be trying to help them by providing them with some consultative advice as to how best to go about constructing their park.

Two rules that are very difficult to deal with compatibly, you can't use a very big stick on someone if you intend later to have them come back to you and seek some of your advice, so I have got a bit of a problem in that regard with some people in the audience today that know my role, they know I have to do well at a time when it is difficult to meet the needs of the role.

The urban parks program is a fairly major grant program. The money is provided by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and in 1979 when the program was finally conceived, Bill Shaw referenced it earlier when he said Red Deer was lobbying the government as early as 1974. In 1979 they finally put together $57,000,000 of Heritage Fund money was devoted to this project. Five cities are involved in receiving these funds, working more or less south to north they are the cities of Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Lloydminster and Grande Prairie. The forerunners of this program, as Bill alluded to, started early in the '70's when Position Paper 13 was developed by Alberta Provincial Parks. And in that position paper was reference to the need to bring facilities closer to the people. We had seen up to that point in time I think a reliance on the mountain parks and national parks here, and also a tendency among park planners to try and find the best resources and develop those resources for recreational opportunities for the public. So

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

there began to be a change in the thinking in government circles, at least, but I believe also in some of the advisory groups as well, that we needed to start to look at the need to bring facilities to the people.

So what happened in the early '70's, there were a couple of experiments tried, I view them as experiments because I see what I think of now as the final model, maybe there will be more models, I don't know. But Capital City Park, Capital City Recreation Park was built in the City of Edmonton by the Department of Environment with the objective of dedicating a major portion of the city river valley to the two purposes of conservation, preserving some green space for the city, and also providing some recreation opportunities. That was originally in 1974 dollars to be a $34,000,000 project that includes the areas that is now designated as Strathcona Science Park, and it also included $5,000,000 for land acquisition in the portion of the river valley that was subject to flooding. That $5,000,000 hasn't been totally spent yet, and as a civil servant I'm curious to know how the City is going to deal with their desire to purchase more river valley land given the current council who seem reluctant to pursue that purpose.

At the same time Capital City Park was being developed, Fish Creek Provincial Park in Calgary was undertaken by the province as a direct delivery kind of development. In other words, the big bad guys in Edmonton made the decision, I think that seems to be the theme that I've been hearing all along anyway, that anything that happens by the province the decision is made in Edmonton, I would tend to disagree that that was the case in all instances, particularly with Fish Creek. But Fish Creek Park was built by the province, and it was along the same lines as the urban park program and Capital City Park.

Just to jump back again to the urban park program, I have got a goal for the program that I would like to read because I don't want to mess it up.

"The establishment of significant areas of open space to ensure urban populations have easy access to natural environments and the development of these areas to enable their sustained and unimpaired use for outdoor recreation."

Again, we have the same kind of dual mandate that national parks has been trying to cope with all these years, and provincial parks as well. But perhaps setting it in an urban setting makes it a little easier to understand the dual statement of these plans, and perhaps recognize that we are not going to create or preserve pristine wilderness in some of these urban environments. Some of the objectives of the program that we had in mind and that we more or less delivered to the client cities at the first workshop held in Lloydminster in September of 1981, is that these parks should provide a threshold experience for many urban dwellers, a threshold outdoor recreational experience. And we have heard over the past day and a half how our major park systems have a problem, I think it was a comment that was passed yesterday evening, that we should treat our park users as guests, it would be fine if they would only behave like guests. When people come to my home, they know what manner of behavior is expected because they visit other homes a lot.

One of the problems with park users, I think, particularly as our population becomes more urbanized and people are less familiar with park environments, is that they don't know what the appropriate behavior is. They don't know what the consequences of their actions are in carving their initials in a tree, for instance, driving a nail in to bang up a clothesline to dry their clothes out, and these sorts of behaviors, I think, are the kind of thing that we should begin to modify by reaching potential users of our provincial and national park systems before they get out into those systems, teach them right in the urban environment through school programs, through service clubs, or through youth organizations. Provide them with a threshold experience

right where they live.

Another objective was to preserve our natural heritage, and I think Bill Shaw dealt with it earlier in outlining some of the responsibilities of the Regional Planning Commission. We see the urban park programs as an opportunity to size up our heritage resources in the urban environment. There was a slide of the Gaetz Lakes Waterfowl Sanctuary which is right in the city limits of Red Deer. On the way down I pointed out to Guy Swinnerton an area that was a natural area, or candidate natural area right on the side of Highway 2 Maskepatoon Park which has now been incorporated in Red Deer urban parks, and these areas, I might add just for your interest, the land has been taken over from the province and more or less deeded to the City for a dollar; all have caveats against them. In other words, if the use of land changes for some reason in the future when we are all gone, there is a provision there for the province to recall these properties and ensure that they are once again restored for the intent that they are currently held for now. So in other words, if things get out of hand municipally, the province can intervene and return these lands to the provincial trust.

In addition we foresee the objective of preserving our cultural heritage to some extent. In the case of Grande Prairie, for instance, there is an early settlers museum which contains artifacts of old farm equipment and so on, and this, although it is not being directly funded by the program, has been integrated into the major use that we foresee for that park. In addition, we also saw the objective of providing an accessible park experience to the less mobile of the population, this includes people who are financially unable to get in their car and drive to the mountains, people who may be physically uncapable of enjoying an experience in one of our parkland provincial or national recreational areas.

I mentioned that there was $57,000,000 dedicated to

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

this program, and I imagine you are wondering how it was divided up, everybody seems to ask that question. $5.5 million in 1979 dollars was dedicated to the City of Lloydminster; $7,000,000 to Grande Prairie; $11,000,000 to Medicine Hat; $14.8 million to Lethbridge and $18.8 million to Red Deer. You heard Bill Shaw refer to $28,000,000 grant, when you take inflation into account this program is indexed to inflation, so the dollars that are dedicated will not be eroded over time if there is a certain amount of inactivity, and the opposite perspective, the cities don't have to run out and spend all their money yesterday for fear of the value of their grant diminishing, so they can take time to do the appropriate planning and move cautiously to develop their parks. Lately, the press has been playing up this program as one of the Heritage Fund grants that has run amok, and I think it reflects badly on me and I object to it; it hasn't run amok. Generally these figures are per capita grants, although I have to admit in all honesty they were not based on per capital formulae; they were based on proposals that were conceived in the late '70's, ultimately made a package that went to Cabinet where the decision was made.

The money can be spent in a variety of ways. Ten percent of it can be spent on planning and design, up to 40 percent on land acquisition, leaving a minimum of 50 percent for capital development. Now if a community wants to go out and undertake with their own staff all the planning and design, and if they choose not to buy any land, they can use the entire portion of this grant for facility development. The reason we developed the program this way is there have been problems in the past where if lands could not be acquired through the grant, often the best facilities were not developed, because the best parcels of land were unavailable for development because the municipal authorities simply couldn't afford to purchase the best land to ultimately put in the best recreation facilities.

In addition to the capital grant, which is the Heritage

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

Fund, there is an operations and maintenance component to this plan which lasts for 30 years, and commences one year after the capital phase is started. So till the year 2011, the province will have a stake in the operation of these facilities. The reason being we feel it's a fairly significant lay-on for some of these communities to expect their tax dollars to cover the operation of these facilities. We see them as being regional parks, although they are in urban settings, so that not all the users are going to come out of that city area, therefore we have undertaken a fairly major share of the operating costs of these facilities.

I would like to believe there is not too much red tape involved in this program. I hope Jean Sloan will agree with me, Jean is an alderman from Lloydminster who is fairly closely involved with the urban park program there, and I think we are able to respond fairly quickly to the needs of the communities when they are expressed to us.

Without exception where a major river course or stream course existed, those lands have been devoted to urban parks, and I think this is where we are starting to zero in on the need to be concerned about water and its uses in the province. Three of these cities lie in the South Saskatchewan River Basin, all three of them have parks which I would consider make up the most significant portion of their river valley areas within the city limits. If there are significant changes to the flow regime of the South Saskatchewan River Basin, these parks would be significantly impacted.

Although there isn't that much contact with recreation occurring along these river basins, it is my view that the threat that exists added significantly to the value of these parks. It is kind of like Fort Knox, you don't have to see the gold that is in there to know that it is significant. You don't have to use the rivers all the time to know that they are significant, but the fact that it is there makes

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

you feel kind of reassured.

Lloydminister has a special situation because they have no significant water bodies. They have considered the need to develop an urban recreational lake, as have many of the other communities in fact even where significant rivers exist, and I will deal with that shortly.

The kinds of facilities that are being constructed in these parks are predominantly, because of their original makeup, trails for walking, hiking, if you like, my context of hiking doesn't really fit the urban setting that these parks are being developed in, I guess there are people that go for a hike in them. Horse riding, interpretive trails were very important in some portions of these parks, and cross-country ski trails for a winter alternative for the majority of the trails' development. Day use activities are very important, particularly for families, and also group picnicking. Barry Rogers mentioned group camping, but I submit that group picnicking is also a very significant activity, particularly when we have got a resource right in the middle of an urban setting. Playgrounds sort of jumped out of the neighborhood type structure, building significant playgrounds like we see in Hawrelak Park in Edmonton, for instance, my children like to go down there because they know that it's not the standard kind of playground, it's a special event for them to go to a major park like that and get involved in a major playground. It's different, I've had my three-year old saying let's go to the big playground dad, and I know he wants to go to Hawrelak Park. So that is a fairly important component of the program.

Although the main thrust of the program is outdoor recreation, we have allowed a certain level of buildings to be built, a certain number of buildings to be built because it is pretty hard to recreate sometimes without a place to seek shelter from the cold if you happen to be out in winter. It is nice to have buildings around where concessionaires can operate skate rentals in the winter, ski rentals perhaps,

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

bike rentals, roller skate rentals, that kind of thing, and in addition, these kinds of facilities also provide a place for the outdoor groups to meet. So in fact they can go in the evening and have a meeting of the bird watching club, and the next morning meet at 5 o'clock and go out to do a bird count in the same area.

Large tracts of green space are being set aside that may never be developed. I think that is an important exercise, because often when you talk mega bucks like we have in this program everybody has the idea that we run right out and develop everything in sight, and I don't think that is the case. I think we have very responsible people involved in all these projects, and I think we will see significant parcels of land set aside where development simply will not occur.

Special facilities have been developed as well, ties to heritage museums and that kind of thing that I alluded to earlier.

I am going to show you some slides now, and I want to start to get into the aspect of my talk that deals with the development of urban recreational lakes. They are different from anything we have talked about so far, because the purpose of them is for recreation. They don't have any particular function for irrigation or hydro-electric generation or anything like that, and I think it is important to recognize there are facilities like this that are being built around the province. And the first one we are going to look at has nothing to do with the urban park program at all, this is Lake Bonavista in Calgary, it was built around the late '60's by a developer who realized that having a large portion of land as most of the Alberta landscape is had no lakes on it, came up with the idea of putting in his own manmade lake with the primary function of making it a recreational lake. And this shot I took a couple of years ago when we had a tour of people through Lake Bonavista, it was actually some of the people on the urban

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

park program that were down there for a conference, and this fellow standing there fishing was catching himself some trout that had survived very well in this lake. This is the Inn on Lake Bonavista that exists almost solely because the lake is there, provides a good commercial opportunity for an entrepreneur, and also provides a nice setting for weddings and that sort of thing. Now Lake Bonavista was dedicated, I'm told, this could be inaccurate, but I am told by the fellow that currently operates the facility, it was dedicated in addition to what was required by the then planning regulations. In other words, the lands were dedicated for public recreation aside from these lands. The lake was made just simply by excavating a hole, there was a hill built right adjacent to it, large green space created, the entire park is fenced, and only the residents of the neighborhood are permitted access; residents and guests. It sounds a little exclusive, and it may bother some of you, it did me at first, but I can rationalize it. This is a little waterfall, I apologize for the quality of this slide but the light was failing at the time we were there. This waterfall aerates the water which is pumped out of the lake to the top of the hill, spashes down, gains some oxygen and goes back into the lake and sustains the fish population.

Now I don't believe the developer lost any money on this development. To give you an idea of the significance of this kind of resource in the province, looking at it from other than a recreational perspective, lakefront lots, lakefront homes in Bonavista now run anywhere from $350,000 to $450,000. Homes that are not on the lake are in the neighborhood of $140,000. That should tell you something about the significance of aesthetics of water and recreational opportunities that exist.

This is also a non-urban park, this is Fish Creek Provincial Park, a nice aerial shot, and it shows the lake under construction. Now Sikome Lake was built, as I indicated, in the late '70's. The design capacity of the

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

lake was to be 3,000 people, that is what was planned for. What actually happened since we started having some warm sunny days after the facility was completed, and this is carried right through till this past summer, on a warm sunny weekend day you get 15,000 or more people at this facility. This facility cost approximately the same amount to build as an indoor swimming pool would. Using very rough estimates of the costs to operate this facility, I calculated that the average user cost of this facility is about 75 cents per use in summer, well, all year round for that matter. So there aren't very many indoor pools that can boast that claim, in fact, most indoor pools which charge an admission fee which Sikome lake does not, would be hard-pressed to say they survive with less than a 75-cent subsidy from the municipal board, in most cases it would be higher. In other words, you are paying $2 to get in plus the tax base that subsidizes your visit a certain amount.

So I guess what I am doing is advocating the development in certain instances of recreational swimming lakes, because they are economically feasible. I don't want to get on to this subject of parks charging for day use, we don't have to think too hard to figure that if they did charge a nominal fee they might cover their costs.

Let's take a look at some of the use at Sikome Lake. These are not my slides by the way, you can't accuse me of anything. You see that there has been ample provision as well for commercial opportunities. The lake has got several concession operations where fast food is provided, there are lifeguards to look after the people, although the number of lifeguards fall below the standards for swimming pool facilities which I guess Public Health regards this type of facility as being. And I think it is very important that I think we are going to perhaps ultimately see a day when a new type of facility is created for the purposes of public health acts, and we have a whole new series of regulations to try and deal with this item that is neither a pool nor a lake.

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

Just to show that there are people that actually use the facilities in winter as well, here are a few people down skating.

Now, what is happening in the urban parks? I will try and breeze through these things fairly quickly. This is a shot of Bower Ponds in Red Deer that existed before the urban park program. Since this slide was taken it's been dredged out, it's been used to build a sliding hill, and this lake was already a stockable lake so we're hoping that it is going to be even that much better now that it is deeper. This is a very bad shot, I apologize, this is an area that was a gravel pit, and Alberta Environment operates a recreation program that is supposedly supposed to restore an area to its previous condition, previous to the gravel being extrapolated. In this instance it was determined that they could spend probably no more money and create a recreational lake, so that is exactly what they did. Instead of filling the hole in and throwing a bunch of seed on top, they dug the hole deeper and created a lake that we hope can be stocked with trout. This happens to make up a portion of the Waskasu Park that is the western terminus of a major bike path, you can not drive within half a mile of this lake. You can get there by horse-drawn cart, you can get there by horse, you can get there by bike, you can get there on foot, but you can't get there in a vehicle. And in fact, when you get down on that lake you almost think that you are out in the country somewhere were it not for the fact that there is diesel trucks going by on Highway No. 2 about a mile away, you could probably convince yourself you were out in the country somewhere.

We jump down to Medicine Hat now, and this is a little detail of what they're doing there. This is for the non-physical contact lake, the water quality is too poor to allow people to get in this water, the bacterial count is just right off the scale. But there is going to be fountains there, there will be a walkway around the outside,

CHAIRMAN WOOD
(Lacey)

it will be a nice aesthetic place to be in the summer. You can go there in the winter and skate, there will be a little pavilion built right adjacent to it. Here is another shot of it from a little further away, and you can see that some of the trail detail is compressed in there between the taking of those two slides. Also in Medicine Hat they will be putting in a swimming lake, and in addition, they hope to put in a stockable trout lake as well. So they will be providing some fairly divergent opportunities as far as water opportunities in Medicine Hat.

Lethbridge has already got Nicholas Sheran Lake, I think I pronounced that right, anyway they've got it. It is primarily a storm water retention lake that is used primarily for irrigation purposes. This is it here, it is not in the urban park by the way, but I thought I would show it just to give you an idea what is happening outside the urban park program. This is a lake that is stocked with a few trout, and right in West Lethbridge. Also in the urban park program there is a proposal to deepen Henderson Lake to improve the water quality. Henderson Lake has been there for a very long time and it is included in the urban park proposal so that the overall existing park system could be integrated fairly well with the majority of the urban park that is going in along the Oldman River.

Just so you don't think my zeal for manmade recreational lakes in an urban environment is the only thing that is causing these things to be developed, I want to give you some information gleaned from the public participation programs, of which there were many and lots, and conducted very thoroughly through all these urban parks. I will give you some information to illustrate that the public did in fact see a need for these kinds of resources. In Red Deer when they conducted a user survey, they found that people were asked to select eight items, eight activities they would like to see in the urban parks out of a list of about 25. Eighty-nine percent of them picked picnicking and day

activities, 82 percent picked hiking trails, 75 percent wanted to see bike and pedestrian trails, 61 percent wanted a canoe launch, 56 percent wanted a swimming hole, and 55 percent wanted a fishing hole. So you can see that those canoe launch, swimming holes and fishing holes rated fairly high in the people's minds. They wanted that kind of opportunity in an urban setting.

In Lethbridge, where a home survey was conducted, people were given the opportunity of choosing from a preselected list of activities or undertakings, and the second most popular proposal for the Henderson Lake area was in fact the dredging of the lake. People felt that if the lake was dredged it would be useable for a lot more things.

So you can see people regard water based recreation as a very important facet of their recreational lives. I think we need to be cognizant of that because it is very, very hard to put an economic value on that kind of opportunity. One of the frustrations I have had in being a recreational professional has been that I am continually faced with cost benefit analyses that work out to the penny the value of the tree, the value of the square foot of cultivated land, but we have had a very difficult time trying to gauge the value of recreational opportunity, and I think we need to be cognizant of that. If we sit down and look at a study, we won't mention any in particular, but when you look at the study for the utilization of water you have to be aware that while somebody can make a very strong argument for the thousands of dollars that are going to accrue to various coffers as a result of certain alternatives, when you grade recreation opportunities as high, medium and low, it doesn't give you a very strong base from which to argue the recreational side of the point of view. I'm going to end my presentation there, I'm very sorry it is 6 o'clock. You were a very attentive audience, you must be awfully hungry. Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN WOOD: The suggestion has just been made that we should ask the panel if they will be here tomorrow, we are ahead of schedule on our resolutions, and we have a nice little piece of time. Are you going to be here tomorrow? I am not the one who's making the regulations, Ken is the one that tells me we have to be out of here, I would be happy to stay here for another hour.

MR. NELSON: The only reason for my suggestion that we need to be on our way is for those of you who are planning to take advantage of our expense account meal, we have to be in there before 7 o'clock in order to collect it. And for those of us who plan to be a little more frivolous tonight, we have got to get on that bus going downtown at 7 o'clock for those of us who are going to pay for a nice meal downtown and that's a different story. That is my only concern is that by 7 o'clock those of us who are going to have supper here will have to have been there to get it, that is my only problem.

CHAIRMAN WOOD: Does anyone wish to stay or is everyone going to go to the cafeteria?

MR. NELSON: The crowd has told you what they want to do. If I might make a quick announcement that might solve everybody's problem, those of you who would like to perhaps come back and see us later, the water management model is going to be set up about 7 o'clock, the film will be on at 8:30, I will be around, and perhaps we can speak to some of these people at that point.

(MEETING ADJOURNED UNTIL SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10TH, 1983)

MORNING SESSION -

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: It's very gratifying to see so many of you out this early in the morning to get down to business. Also at this time I would like to again stress the fact that we have had a very successful year, and the results of our success will probably be the responses from the resolutions that will be presented at this meeting.

So to start off this part of our session, we will now call for Chairmen's Reports, and I'll call for them in the order that they are printed in your brochure. Unless you Chairmen prefer to read them, I would rather not have them read, but have the Chairman come up and make any comments in addition to or add to the report, or answer any questions that may come from the floor. To start off the Chairman's Reports, I would like to call upon the Chairman of -- well, my report is the first one, I have really nothing to add to it unless there are any questions, and therefore I submit it as printed. Hearing no comments, therefore I move that the first report be accepted as printed. Do I have a seconder to that?

MR. BLOM: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Is there any discussion of this report? Are you ready for the question, the question is being called, all those in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Opposed?

(NONE)

(CARRIED)

(ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE ACCEPTED AS PRINTED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: The next report in the brochure is the report from the Chairman of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee, and Julian, would you come forward? I would ask all the Chairmen to come forward and move the adoption of their report as printed.

DR. GUAY: I would like to announce that unintentionally in error that Suzy Washington's name was left off the committee member's list, and I apologize for that. I designed this report to read it, that is why it is so brief, so if you don't mind I would like to read it through very quickly with you.

Annual Report of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee:

This has been a very active year for the Environmental Education Advisory Committee. We had a total of eight meetings in Calgary.

(1) At the first meeting in February, a new chairman and vice-chairman were elected for the EEAC.

(2) A letter was directed to the Minister with reference to making the public aware of environmental issues through a media advertising campaign. At the coordinating meeting of June 30th, the Minister agreed that it was important to make the public more aware of environmental concerns in Alberta. He felt that Environment Week would be an ideal vehicle for this purpose and he hopes to start looking at this in preparation for 1984.

(3) A resolution entitled "Government Grant Support for Leadership and Educational Efforts of Citizen Environmental Groups" was drafted and forwarded through the proper channels.

(4) Over the past year, several long-standing members of EEAC resigned and were replaced by new members.

(5) The new membership brought a revitalized direction to the committee. Considerable time was utilized in re-examining the role of the EEAC, developing a priorized list of projects/actions/resolutions. Dan Stoker presented a methodology for dealing with these projects, actions and resolutions.

(6) Some of the guest speakers invited to the EEAC this past year were Linda Duncan on "Environment Law", Betty Hunter on "Environment Week", Bill Washburn - "Education

Committee" -- a subcommittee of the Calgary Olympic Development Committee, and Reg Houghton, "Inadequacies and Adequacies in Environmental Education Curriculums".

(7) A letter was drafted and sent to the various agencies and resulted in the development of a coordinating position for Environment Week 1984.

(8) Planning is well underway for an Alberta Invitational Environmental Education Conference for 1984.

In summary, it has been a very ambitious and successful year for the Environmental Education Advisory Committee.

I would like to thank all the members of the EEAC for their tremendous efforts this past year. I feel this year has been a genuine committee endeavor from the standpoint that the actual tasks were initiated and completed by many different members.

A very special thanks to Randalin Pretty for all her help and extra effort which enabled the Environmental Education Advisory Committee to function smoothly.

Thank you.

I would like to move the adoption or acceptance of this report. Seconded? Seconded by Bill Batycky. Is there any discussion or comments? Call the question, all those in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Opposed?

(NONE)

(CARRIED)

(THE REPORT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACCEPTED AS READ)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you very much, our next report is a report from the Science Advisory Committee, and our Chairman?

DR. THOMPSON: I'm Dixon Thompson, Chairman of the Science Advisory Committee. There is no need for me to repeat what is in front of you in black and white. A few additional comments, however, S.A.C. is in the process of

discussing our roles and responsibilities and what we hope to accomplish in the next year or two, and there seems to be a consensus developing that one of the things we have to do is work hard to improve our credibility as a Science Advisory body. I think this entails attempts to reduce the number of items we consider on the agenda, fewer ad hoc responses to issues, less concern about people attending meetings and more attention to study some substance of specific issues. We hope to have individual members spend more time preparing reports for S.A.C.'s review and ultimate presentation to the government, or to appropriate agencies.

The second way in which we hope to improve our credibility is to increase the role that we would play as a resource body and as a review body for the scientific reports prepared by the E.C.A. staff. This has been discussed briefly and is thought to be a reasonable role for S.A.C. We would like to be able to provide more scientific advice and scientific information to the various P.A.C. study groups if they will come to S.A.C. beforehand, before they get deeply into a study, we would like to try and provide some advice or leads as to where to go for detailed information.

Finally, in the most optimistic of all possible worlds, we would like eventually to gain enough credibility that the Minister would consider us as a body to come to for comments or review of some of the scientific issues that he has to deal with. Whether or not that is a possibility remains to be seen. Finally we wanted to discuss more strategy and tactics to become more effective in seeing that the recommendations or comments that we make on scientific issues really have some impact.

We will return to the publishing of an annual report on S.A.C. activities, that was dropped temporarily after I think Harvey Buckmaster completed the last annual report some years ago, and so we will move to an annual report in which we will

submit the matters of substance that we have dealt with over that particular year.

With that I would like to move acceptance of the report as it stands. Do we have a seconder? Chris Dunkley. Is there any comments or questions? Seeing none, I would like to call the question, those in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Opposed?

(NONE)

(CARRIED)

(ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACCEPTED AS PRINTED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: The next report to be presented would be the annual report of the Membership Committee.

MR. FLOOR: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to read this report for two reasons, first of all this is largely a chronical that refers by name to a large number of people and I would like to make sure that you have their names before you. The other is that a part of it was inadvertently missed, so I would like to include it when I read this. It will only take a few minutes and I crave your indulgence.

For the year 1983, your Membership Committee consisted of Mrs. Betty Hunter, Ms. Louise Horstman, Mr. Ron Whistance-Smith and myself as Chairman.

Meetings were held on January 26th and September 29th, and a number of more routine matters were settled by telephone conferences between myself and the Committee members on March 14th, March 30th and May 13th.

The membership list was under constant review throughout the year and updated lists were issued in February, May, August and November.

During the period the following 25 members resigned from P.A.C.:

Mr. J. Arruda	Mr. D. Patching
Ms. L. Bakker	Mr. R. G. Proudfoot
Ms. S. Blazina	Mr. R. Rizzoli
Mr. W. Blocksidge	Ms. J. Russell
Ms. J. Dart	Mr. T. Shewchuk
Mr. G. Dixson	Mr. M. Slomp
Mr. W. J. Francl	Mr. E. Stolarchuk
Mrs. J. Kelman	Mr. P. Thomas
Mr. W. L. Kergan	Mr. S. Thompson
Mr. D. MacIsaac	Mr. K. Warren
Ms. B. Mundel-Atherstone	Mr. R. T. White
Mr. G. Norman	Mrs. D. Whitenett
Mrs. M. Oldring	

To all of these public-spirted volunteers, as well as Dr. H. W. Habgood and Dr. F. W. Schwartz who resigned from S.A.C., and Mrs. J. Crook, Mr. L. McKibben, Mr. A. Smandych, Mr. George Shaw and Mr. Bob Westbury who left the Environment Educational Committee, I wish to tender our sincere thanks for their services and best wishes for success in their future endeavors.

Three new associations were added to the growing list of P.A.C. constituents and they supplied members as follows:

Energy Resources Conservation Board - Mr. E. Brushett.

Girl Guides of Canada (Alberta Council) - Mrs. T. F. Clement.

Health Unit Association of Alberta - Mrs. M. Abdurahman

We also issued invitations to the following groups who have not yet responded:

Boy Scouts of Alberta; City of Fort McMurray; City of Leduc; Leduc Chamber of Commerce; Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce; Medicine Hat Chamber of Commerce; Red Deer Chamber of Commerce; and the Solar Energy Society. We hope that they will soon be adding new members to the ranks of our members.

S.A.C. also added Dr. Chip Beatty; Linda Duncan; Dr.

Ralph Nursall; Dr. Bill Phillips, and the Environmental Education Committee added Miss Sally Banks; Dr. Lewis Fenna; Mrs. Colleen Gardner; Mr. Brian Plesuk; Dan Stoker; and Suzy Washington. To all these we wish to offer a sincere welcome.

Each year a number of members whose terms expire are willing to undertake an additional term of service. We feel especially indebted to these public spirited people, and our congratulations and compliments are therefore offered to the following on their reappointment:

Don Abbey	Mr. George Lane
Dr. Lochan Bakshi	Mr. D. J. Lewoniuk
Bill Batycky	Mr. J. Lickacz
Eric Berndt	Professor A. Lucas
Dr. R. Davies	Mrs. Martha Lutz
Professor Peter Dranchuk	Mr. G. F. Paschen
Mr. M. Colledge	Mr. R. C. Proudfoot
Dr. Sheri Dalton	Mr. Pat Seymour
Dr. R. Gehrke	Dr. R. Shaw
Mr. D. Gemmill	Dr. Dixon Thompson
Mr. R. A. Hill	Dr. Terry Veeman
Dr. Arnold Lamb	Dr. Lub Wojtiw

New members were added to the affiliated roster, this is a very select group of people who after considerable service with P.A.C. earned the approval of their comrades to the extent that they are requested to stay on as unaffiliates. These included this year: Dorothy Broadbent; Mr. Don Broughton; Mr. Dennis Dube; Ms. Joanne Hedenstrom; Dr. Martha Kostuch; Mr. Bob Richardson; and Mrs. Lena Scraba.

At the end of the year the roster stood at 188 members, including alternates and non-affiliated members representing 133 separate organizations. Of these, 22 were members of the Science Advisory Committee, 13 of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee; 14 were unaffiliated members, and 34 were alternates.

For some time, ladies and gentlemen, your Membership

Committee has felt that there was insufficient use of alternates to replace regular members who could not attend a meeting. This subject was discussed at length and it was felt that alternate members were probably not being kept sufficiently informed of the current affairs of study groups to feel comfortable when required to attend meetings at short notice.

As a result, the following motion was introduced by Betty Hunter, seconded by Ron Whistance-Smith and carried by the Committee:

> "BE IT RESOLVED THAT alternates who would like to receive copies of minutes should contact the P.A.C. Secretariat and arrangements will be made to see that they are sent copies of minutes."

You are all therefore requested to advise your alternates of this so that a list of those requesting the service can be assembled and added to the regular distribution lists for the various study groups.

That is the end of my report, ladies and gentlemen, and I would propose that this be accepted.

MRS. HUNTER: I would like to second that.

MR. FLOOK: Are there any questions? In that case, all in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

(APPROVAL OF THIS REPORT IS CARRIED)

(REPORT OF THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE ACCEPTED AS READ)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Our next report would be from the Energy Study Group.

MR. SHAW: Thank you Mr. Chairman and good morning ladies and gentlemen. Like the previous, or some of the previous Chairmen, I don't think I am going to belabor you with my report in detail, but there are a few comments I would like to make. I was just appalled by that membership report that Bill Flook gave. I will be talking later this afternoon, I think I am the last one on the program this afternoon, about the status of the Energy Group. Now if you have or do read this report of ours, you will notice that I

made mention of nine members, I see that on the list of names there are 13 names, but there are about four that are there that are no longer in the study group. So that brings it down to the figure of nine, but actually we only have eight active members.

This afternoon, I will be asking the conference to decide what is going to happen to this group. We have practically no members, we can't get any more, plus we can't steal any from any of the other groups, and the new people coming in don't seem to be very interested in the subject of energy.

We did have, I think, a good year. Unfortunately or otherwise, the Chairman that started the group really left the group two years ago, Chris Walker, he is not here today, and he had to give up the position due to a change of employment and the pressures of his new job, and the boys and girls in our group had enough faith to elect me as Chairman; so I carried on for the rest of the year. I would like to thank Chris Walker here for his very good efforts while he was Chairman, and I do want to thank those members of our group that attended regularly.

The future next year looks as though there will only be about three people left to carry on the group, so that it will have to be integrated, disbanded or something. But we will go into that this afternoon, I don't want to go into it right now.

We had meetings all but two months, we had some wonderful speakers, some good subjects, but it still didn't stimulate any interest. So with those words, I will move the adoption of the report. Can I have a seconder please? Gordon Cameron. Are there any questions you would like to ask at this point, or do you wish to reserve them for this afternoon? No questions, may I ask for the vote? All in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

(PASSED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Our next report is from the Environment Protection Study Group.

DR. SWINNERTON: Good morning ladies and gentlemen, I am Guy Swinnerton of the Environment Protection Study Group. Once again I don't think I need to belabor you by taking you through the contents of the annual report, but just to touch perhaps on a couple of highlights. It was decided a year this last November that topic focus for the year would be the Slave River project. We had a number of meetings, as you can see from the written report on that particular topic. Ironically, in some ways, the fact that the guidelines for the Slave project, the impact statement has not been released yet meant that to some extent the whole process of examining the issue was put on hold. The study group intends to remain cognizant of what is going on there, and recharge its batteries if you like, to address the issue when it comes to a focal point again.

The other areas that we have looked at during the year have concerned aspects of wildlife and obviously the Mount Allan site, and our intention is in the year ahead that those areas will remain very much on our list of interest. I should perhaps point out that at our November meeting, largely because of pressures of work for myself at the university, I have stepped down as Chairman, and Bob Richardson has been kind enough to take on that role. I would like at this point to wish him a successful year.

In conclusion, I should also like to extend my thanks to the E.C.A. staff for all the help they gave the study group, particularly Randy Pretty and Bill Flook, and also the other members who interfaced with the study group over the preceding 12 months.

At that point I would like to move adoption of the report. Do I have a seconder please? Bob Richardson.

Is there any points of discussion or clarification? The question please, all in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Against?
(NONE)
(PASSED)
CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Our next report is the report of the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group.
MRS. HUNTER: I am not going to add anything to my report either in the content of it. However, there was a very serious omission, and that was my thanks to Randy Pretty particularly and the help of the E.C.A. staff. I don't how I was so negligent, I'm sure that they all know how much I appreciated all their help.
I would like to move the adoption of this report. Seconder? Gerry Paschen. All those in favor?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
(CARRIED)
CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you Betty. Our next report will be the report from the Pollution Study Group.
DR. WOJTIW: I think I have a couple of comments to make. First of all, this will be my last year as Chairman of the Pollution Study Group, and I would like to publicly thank all the members of the Pollution Study Group for their enthusiasm and their efforts throughout the 1983 year, for making it such a successful year for the group. The other comment that I would like to make is that one of the greatest achievements of the Pollution Study Group has been able to make this year is obtaining funds and conducting an environmental study for the Lodgepole blowout. This is the first time that a public advisory group was able to obtain funds of this magnitude to conduct a study into issues of concern to the public. Dr. Martha Kostuch was appointed by the Pollution Study Group to take care of this study for us, and she has successfully completed this work on behalf of the Pollution Study Group and P.A.C. I think we do owe her a thanks of gratitude.
(APPLAUSE)
I would like to also, last but not least, thank Bill

Flook, Randy Pretty and the rest of the Environment Council staff for their continuous support, and I know I would come rushing in and give them another letter to write, and they must have wondered every time I came into the office because there was more work to be done and I would like to thank them for all their continuous efforts throughout 1983 and for helping the study group conduct its affairs.
With that I would like to move the adoption of the report as it is published in the Chairmen's Reports. Do we have a seconder for that? Ridley Shaw. Are there any questions? The question now, all in favor?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
Opposed?
(NONE)
(CARRIED)
CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you, Lub. Our next report will be the annual report of the Renewable Resources Study Group.
DR. WOOD: Most of the story is before you, and a little bit of follow-up which is interesting. When we met with the Minister a while ago, we told him we were going to propose our resolution, and he sort of laughed at this idea of this joint site thing. Well, we were rather fortunate we got to know the Chairman of the Strathcona Industrial Association who favors this idea. He in turn is a good friend of Walter Solodzuk, so hopefully that helped. It will be an ongoing thing, it will be interesting to see how the whole thing comes out. I see there is an announcement in the paper that the Minister is going to announce the site of the hazardous waste disposal early in the new year; whatever that means. He didn't say which year.
I think that's about all there is to the follow-up. I'd like to move adoption of this report. Ron Whistance-Smith seconded it. Any discussion, questions or whatever? Those in favor?
(SHOW OF HANDS)
(PASSED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you. Our next report is the annual report of the Urban Environment Study Group.

MRS. SLOAN: In the absence of our Chairman and our Vice-Chairman, I have been chosen to represent the group. The report is before you, and we have high hopes in the coming year of getting a more pertinent focus on our endeavors, and we will need the support of the member groups on that, because we kind of encroached on everybody's territory.

With that, I would like to move the adoption of the report of the Urban Environment Study Group. Seconded by Allan Smith. All in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Opposed?

(NONE)

(PASSED)

(REPORT OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT STUDY GROUP ACCEPTED AS PRINTED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: This concludes the Chairmen's Reports and I would like to also add my thanks to the staff of the E.C.A. who supported me, and the Coordinating Committee who supported me in all of the work that I have done so far.

Our next item on the agenda is a report from the E.C.A. Research Division by Mr. Dave Buchwald.

MR. BUCHWALD: The Research Division is one of the three divisions in the Environment Council, and is staffed by eight research officers, myself and an excellent secretary that keeps us all functioning and going in the right direction. We are the technical support group to all the Council's activities. This falls into three areas; public hearings, ongoing policy and program review, and some assistance to P.A.C. itself.

The public hearing process is fairly extensive, and it goes through about four phases, and the research crew is involved in all four phases. The first phase is the preparation of background material, and as you can see, some of the projects are getting fairly immense judging by the

amount of publications out on display in the other building. About 75 percent of those reports are prepared by research staff, and the other 25 percent by consultants and by departments.

After the background information is prepared, we go into a pre-hearing information program, and that is done jointly between the research staff and the liaison people, particularly Ken Nelson. So there's usually about two or three research officers involved in Ken getting the information out to the public.

The next stage is the hearing itself, and you will see at the hearings, either agriculture or some of the others, you will see a crew off on the side, usually two or three individuals writing like mad, and what we are doing is a content analysis on all the information that is presented to the hearing. So if you look at the reports or recommendations, you can take a look at the brief that was being presented and what influence you had on the totality of the final report.

The last phase of the hearing is preparation of the report and recommendations, and usually that involves a writing team of the panel and two or three research people. This has some advantages because when the report is completed and the panel is disbanded, it means that there is some expertise inside the E.C.A. that knows some of the background of what went into the report. One paragraph on Page 23 of the report was in fact originated from four pages and quite a bit of heavy discussion.

I have identified in the report who worked on the different parts of the past hearings, and that is so if there is some questions come up about say Oldman River or hazardous wastes or noise, that you can identify that there are staff in the office that can provide you with information if you so desire.

In the policy and program review area, and I have called this for kind of convenience, but I think in fact the policy and review program takes place through three phases - the

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK
(Buchwald)

public hearings, the E.C.A. staff reports and through the activity of P.A.C. itself.

There are two reports that were completed in 1983, one was by consultants on environmental standards, which is a comparison of Canadian standards setting process and enforcement. The other one was a report on wildlife road kills and potential mitigation in Alberta. There is four reports that are fairly complex that are not quite finished yet, and I imagine it will be a few months yet before they are. They look at water quality management in Alberta, and air quality management in Alberta, and they are really an assessment of the Clean Air and Clean Water Act, and their administration and underlying philosophy.

Another report that is nearing completion is looking at the role of the Energy Resources Conservation Board in environmental matters, and its relationship with other jurisdictions and that kind of thing.

And the fourth is looking at acid forming emissions - transportation and effects.

So those two major areas of public hearings and staff reports consume a major portion of our time, probably 80 or 90 percent, and the remainder goes into assisting P.A.C., and that is two major means, one is the ongoing commitment to review resolutions, which seems to be working fine. It would be nice to have them earlier, and the other one is the report that Cal Webb did this year for Renewable Resources Study Group on looking at the use of municipal wastes for fuel, and that is basically what I have to say.

There is five research people in attendance at the meeting, I would encourage you to call them any time you want, trap them in the corner, see what you can get out of them. And basically feel free to discuss anything with them. Thank you.

I move the adoption of the research report.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Do we have a seconder for that? Chris Dunkley. Is there any discussion of this report?

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK
(Buchwald)

MR. FAUSER: Just one question, is that report available for us?

MR. BUCHWALD: There were others asking about that, you should have received it some time ago. Are there others that haven't received notes of it? Okay, I'll check when I get back to the library.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Betty, did you have a question?

MRS. HUNTER: No, I hadn't received a copy of it either.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Martha, did you have a question?

DR. KOSTUCH: Yes, I have. When you have got a report that deals -- that one study group would be interested in, perhaps when it is completed maybe you could make the study group aware of the report and the existence of the report and when it is released.

MR. BUCHWALD: Sure, no problem, I just assumed that the mailing list was accomplishing that, but I will follow up on it.

MR. SMITH: This is the first some of us have heard of some of these reports. I wonder if the people who are responsible for the different reports, when you say get them in a corner, we don't know who to get in a corner.

MR. BUCHWALD: The research staff is over here, Kim Sanderson, Brian Free, John Lilley and Cal Webb.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Would they stand up, please?

MR. BUCHWALD: If you look at past hearings, the Oldman River, John worked on that one. Hazardous wastes was John Lilley and Mike Kelly, Mike is not here. The noise was Tom Cottrell and Mary Gordon, neither one of those are here. For the agricultural hearings, Peggy Thompson, Mike Kelly, Cal Webb and Kim Sanderson, both Cal and Kim are here. Under the policy and program review, John worked on Clean Water Act, Mary Gordon and Brian Free, Brian is here, worked on the Clean Air Act. Mary Gordon is responsible for looking at the role of the E.R.C.B. in environmental matters, she is not here, we didn't want to bring the whole crew down. And

acid forming emissions, Kim Sanderson has worked on that one. John Lilley was responsible for administering the contract on the environmental standards, and Kim wrote the report on wildlife road kills.

MS. HEDENSTROM: I was just wondering if I could make a suggestion. So many of the research and reports is interesting, it might be nice if at future conferences to have an afternoon where each committee chooses one project they worked on to give some overview of it to the rest of us, and then we get to share information that we have worked on.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Perhaps that could be suggested to the Coordinating Committee to include in our next conference.

All those in favor of the adoption of the report?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

(CARRIED)

(RESEARCH DIVISION REPORT ACCEPTED AS PRINTED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Our next report is the report from the Nominations Committee, and I would like to call on Mr. Ron Whistance-Smith to take over the meeting.

MR. WHISTANCE-SMITH: The Nominating Committee, consisting of myself, Joyce Finlay and Cam Finlay are pleased to present for your consideration the following;

For Chairman of P.A.C. in the year 1984, Dr. Lub Wojtiw. At this time I would like to call for any other nominations from the floor. Are there any other nominations for the role of Chairman? Last time, are there any other nominations for Chairman? If not, congratulations, Lub.

For Vice-Chairman, we present the name of Dr. Sheri Dalton. Any other nominations from the floor? Second time, any other nominations for the role of Vice-Chairman? Are there any other nominations for the role of Vice-Chairman? If not, congratulations, Sheri.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is your slate for the coming year. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you, Ron.

Now, you have heard the slate for the next year, we have

on our agenda room for what we call Candidate's Forum, so at this time I would like to call on Lub Wojtiw to make all his promises.

DR. WOJTIW: I'd like to thank the Nominating Committee for asking me to serve as Chairman of P.A.C., and I will attempt to carry out the position to the best of my ability. Yesterday at lunchtime one of my members of the Pollution Study Group was sitting beside me and said, you know, I have been coming to meetings for the last year, and I don't know anything about you, and so I will roughly give a brief summary of myself. Basically, I am a research scientist at the Alberta Research Council. I have been involved in weather modification for many years. I have a Bachelor's degree in Honors Math, a Master's degree in computing science, a Master's degree in meteorology, and a Ph.D. in water resources from the Department of Civil Engineering. I have published and co-authored over 35 papers in national and international publications. I have attended numerous conferences in both Canada and the United States, basically on weather modification. I have many hobbies, as some of the members know, and of course, I have served in various positions in various societies and organizations. Currently I am editor of a journal, and I am also editor of a newsletter, so those things do keep me busy.

That briefly sort of summarizes my existence, I guess, and I sort of have a number of beliefs, I would like to express these to you. I haven't made any definite plans yet, because I sort of believe that nominations, these should be carried out through a democratic process. The only thing that one can be sure of is death and taxes, but right now I basically do believe that there are many, that P.A.C. has an important role in the 1980's in Alberta, and I would like to see greater communication between the Minister and the Coordinating Commiteee so that we do discuss some of the issues relevant, not just the Minister of the Environment, have the other Ministers come in and talk to us, and to

endeavor to look at these issues from that aspect. I see 1984 as a very challenging year for P.A.C., and I look forward to the cooperation of both the study groups and the members to working together with me in the pursuance of the goals that P.A.C. has outlined. With that, thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Would anybody care to ask any questions of Lub?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the weather going to be like?

DR. WOJTIW: It depends where it is, there will probably be snow here, that's for sure.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: I would like to call on Sheri, Dr. Sheri Dalton to express any views she wishes, or whatever.

DR. DALTON: Hello, I think most of you have already met me, I am the one that was going around collecting the empty cream containers, I haven't completely lost my mind, you will see the reason for it at noon. I am Sheri Dalton, from Concordia College in Edmonton, I am a zoologist, and since we are doing an academic survey, I got my degree at the University of Western Ontario, and then went down to Massachusetts for a Masters, and then on down to Florida to play with sea turtles for my doctorate, and then I migrated back up to Edmonton, I say migrated because I may go back south again if I can't stand the cold up here any longer.

I have been with P.A.C. for four years in the Environment Study Group, and I have also been with S.A.C. for a year. I have enjoyed very much the work that I have been doing, and I am looking forward to working with Lub and with the rest of you. I am very grateful to the Nominating Committee for nominating me, because I think the position will be a challenge, especially with regard to organizing next year's annual meeting that will be one of my responsibilities as vice-chair. I would like to encourage all of you to make any suggestions on the forms in your folder, because this has been, so far I think, a fairly effective one, and I have greatly enjoyed being in Banff. I

would like to be able to do at least as well next year. Any of the suggestions about the study groups participating directly in the annual meeting was a good one, I was thinking about that last night, and I would like to try and incorporate something like that.

I have got a few ideas of things I'd like to see happen with regard to increasing the effectiveness of P.A.C., increasing the interaction between all of the study groups with P.A.C. and the Environment Education Committee, but like Lub, I haven't really solidified anything because Lub and I have never really worked together before, much less work directly with you in any of this position. Again, any suggestions for things you would like to see happen are gratefully accepted. Anybody have any questions besides what the weather is going to be like?

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: What are the turtles like?

DR. DALTON: Oh, the turtles are nice and warm, the animals I am working with right now are ground squirrels, and they have got the right attitude, they are hibernating right now.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: They live to be 300, I believe.

DR. DALTON: By their years, quite probably, turtles may, ground squirrels I don't know about. Anyway, thank you all very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: I would also like to add my congratulations to Lub and Sheri on their election to their respective offices, and also I would like to thank Louise Horstman for the efforts she put in to organizing this meeting. Unfortunately she could not take on the next step as Chairman, but at any rate, her input is very welcome and I'm sure it will be used in the future as well.

This almost brings us to the close of this session on the agenda, but you might have wondered as to what this construction here beside me is, I didn't know what it was, but Ken Nelson has explained to me that this has been set

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK

up especially to honor one of our members of P.A.C. that are here today who has received an award from the Provincial Government, and the name of the person is Betty Hunter. She received a service award from the Achievement Awards of Alberta, so at this time we would like to turn on this machine and this will give you some idea of what the award is all about, because if you depend on me to describe it, you will soon get plugged up and you will not know what it is anyway. Ken, if you will run the machine.

(FILM BEING SHOWN)

MR. NELSON: Perhaps I can conclude my views on behalf of all of us here, I would like to add my congratulations to Betty Hunter and say thank you for being with us.

(APPLAUSE)

MRS. HUNTER: Thank you all very much. I don't know how you got that from the CBC, but thank you. Quite frankly I have enjoyed every bit of what I have done in my life, and I don't think I need any more congratulations than anybody else, there are hundreds of people who give.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: I would like to add my congratulations, and I am sure that congratulations are being expressed by everyone present here, Betty, and I will say the same thing, thanks for having you with us.

This, ladies and gentlemen, concludes our session for this morning, we will now move back to the Max Bell Auditorium and we will start there promptly at 10 o'clock with the topic "Recreation-Related Environmental Problems in the Green Zone". This will give you ample time to move over there. Thank you very much.

(BRIEF ADJOURNMENT)

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Here we are for the last time, our topic this morning is "Environmental Problems in the Green Zone", it is a huge topic, but we just picked three very qualified people to help us look at a few of the problems in

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN (Short)

the Green Zone. On my immediate left is Paul Short, next to him is Eric Butters, and next to him is Diane Pachal. Mr. Short is the manager of the Integrated Management Planning Section of the Resource Evaluation Planning Division of E.N.R. His section is responsible for the preparation of subregional levels of integrated management plans. Presently there are 12 ongoing plans, the majority of which are on the East Slopes. Mr. Short received a Bachelor of Science degree from the U of C, and after that he worked for Alberta Forest Service with the Forest Land Use Branch, and was involved in Foothills Resource Allocations Study and has continued through to his present position.

Eric Butters is with the Land Use Committee of the Alberta Cattle Commission. He graduated from the U of C and runs a family ranch which he has run since 1978, which has 200 head of cows. The ranch consists of both deeded lands, five year renewable Crown grazing leases, and an annual grazing permit in the Bow Crow Forest Reserve, so we feel that he is qualified to speak about some of the problems.

He is also western stockbroker representative on the Ghost District Integrated Management Plan.

Many of you know Diane, who is the Executive Director of A.W.A., and environmental coordinator for five conservation groups. She has held this position since 1979. Prior to this she was a biologist with the Fish and Wildlife Division out of Calgary, and worked in Kananaskis Country. She obtained a Bachelor's degree in environmental biology from the U of C in 1977.

Since no one has expressed any preference in the order they wish to speak, I would like to ask Mr. Short to lead off.

MR. SHORT: When I asked to address the recreation problems in the Green Area, in reviewing the function that our agency has, we do not have a direct administrative responsibility for any specific recreation delivery, however I did then look at the plans we had in place and reviewed very quickly, highlighting some of the

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

problems we have come across in preparing these plans. As a result, I have put a list together, which I will use an overhead projector on. But before I do that, it also became very apparent that in order for me or us to discuss the resolution mechanisms on some of the problems in more detail, why they were even identified in the plans in the first place, it is important to understand the process and system within which these plans were generated to provide a vehicle by which we could identify the problems we talked about.

What I would like to do very quickly before I get into the list of issues that I am bringing to the attention of this body, is go over very quickly the I.R.M. process, system, I should say, the Integrated Resource Management System. This is a document which has recently been put together within the last year. It has received review at the Natural Resources Advisory Committee which is an A.D.M. level body, it also has gone through what has been called the A.I.P.A.C. group, Alberta Integrated Public Advisory Committee, which deals with policy related matters on planning activities. This document is not at the present time fully distributed as a bona fide government document saying this has the Minister's approval, but we will be seeking that as well.

What I would like to do very quickly is go through this highlighting and overhead projection cassettes or material and the points of concern. I won't get into the process that we use in subregional plans unless there is time or questions from the audience as I understand we only have 15 minutes apiece, I don't know if there is a cattle prod underneath the dais. I obviously won't be able to use the microphone, but I hope there will be no difficulty and I will speak up as loud as I can. Before I start, I'm not too sure of the procedures, do you want us to go through and then wait for questions?

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Yes, we will have questions at the end.

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

MR. SHORT: Okay. The material that very quickly I would like to give an historic background of the integrated management system and why it was created, why it has come in place, and historically we have looked at the 1900's to 1930's we had provincial administration, provincial administration in the 1930's to 1950's, and basically we focused what we perceived as management was basically the administration aspects of resource management. From administration in the 1940's we began to get down into things like multiple use of public land zoning, White, Yellow and Green, became the first major policy for land allocation and management. We have joint federal/provincial agencies such as the Eastern Rocky Forest Conservation Board, developed priorities and guidelines, and we moved to a multiple use approach to public lands management. We began to see the shift from administration to something that was approaching a planning prospective in the management responsibilities. Management of resources in the 1950's to the 1960's we saw the development of the more coordinated system, resource legislation growth, inventories and research programs improved, and the knowledge and abilities to make better land use decisions.

Along this whole continuum there is another continuum that is not on here, and that is the increased pressure for the decision making of resource needs that I think were a part of the present requirement for more concise, more logical, more participative decision making by the government agencies that are charged.

In the 1970's to 1980's the development of a philosophy of integration in the policy and planning, coordination, administrative structures and procedures were established. That very quickly gives what we perceive to be the changed perspective of management that has gone from more of an administrative approach, federal, provincial breakdowns, through to adding more and more of what we call the planning element of the management possibilities. I will get more

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

into that in a moment.

Integrated resource management as a concept we have a definition in the documents, this tries to optimize the use of provincial resource base to achieve maximum benefit for Albertans now and in the future. As a concept we have worked on this with a number of bodies including the A.I.P.A.C. bodies, and I'll get that better explained later. That was what we felt to be the needed direction for integrated resource management.

We established out of that concept some principles of integrated resource management. Integration, basically is more of a philosophical approach, integration as opposed to multiple use considerations. Not all things can occur on the same land. We began to observe this in the multiple use resource allocation study. I am not too sure if any of you are aware of that, but we have report documents that were a part of the E.C.A. hearings that went out in 1976, 1975, and the computer logistics that were put together with that to try to create a composite understanding of what you can do on a piece of land, it's astronomical, and I'm not too sure if any of you have seen that. We move towards a principle of integration.

The resource management, I think this is one of the most, to my way of thinking, difficult areas in what we are trying to do. We couldn't replace the term resource with business management. We were trying to bring more logical management principles to bear on the resource element that are the responsibility of the Crown and government. I think as I showed in the other chart, we have moved in the years to this kind of a basically directing and organizing an administrative mandate. We have moved towards a planning continuum. What is needed, obviously, is this whole complex to be built in together so there is no one element outweighing the others in its delivery.

We only need to look at some of the organizations that we deal with in government to see some of the lopsided

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

elements of administration as opposed to the planning component. If it is a broad specific flow, that's another element of what we had tried to do in bringing that into the perspective of some of the past successes and failures of such things as the Land Use Assignment Committee.

The principles of integrated resource planning; the rest of this discussion, if I could quickly focus only on this aspect of management I.R.M. program. I will not be talking about directing control or organizing, because basically from a resource management perspective, our responsibility deals only with the planning component. The principles we established were needed to be dynamic, flexible and continuous, rational, we needed a team approach. We had to have consultation in the preparation of it, we had to have a comprehensive framework, and we had to involve the public. These are not ordered in any priority listing, it is just simply the way that they flowed out when we discussed the information. There is nothing implied by having public at the bottom at all.

The elements of the planning system; obviously we had a need to have a review and approval process, and with the government and an interdepartmental basis, and I have a chart later that will show you the complexity of the approval sequences which are involved.

We needed to have a decision making process, something that we could logically flow to dialogue through in terms of making inventories, decisions, basically information choice and action. You will find it in the scientific principles, you can find it in making a decision on a car, but we have to have a basic decision making process.

We have, as a result of the principle of consultation, we had to have planning teams. These planning teams are basically designed to make participation a maximum effort from the agencies who are ultimately responsible for the management of resources. We have all of the agencies basically who are within the government given an opportunity

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

to be on those teams. The core body, however, is the Department of Energy and Natural Resources agency, basically because it is defined in the Planning Act that the Crown lands management is dependent upon that piece of legislation; Public Lands Act, which is housed within E.N.R. and under the Associate Minister, Public Lands and Wildlife.

Obviously we needed public involvement, we touched on that, as a framework for decision making, considering the broad specific principle we talked about.

Very quickly then, integrated resource planning approval process, and here's a chart on the complexity that is involved in what has to be done. As you can see, this is a continuum, we come from interdepartmental planning teams and field staff representation in public involvement programs at the plan initiation, I know some of you out there will be saying that's a very stylized and dramatic approach because you haven't always done that. Well, that's true, we can talk about that later. You will see the flow up through directors, the Assistant Deputy Ministers to the Deputy Ministers, on through to the Ministers and on through to the Cabinet Committee that reviews the economic planning and resource development Cabinet Committee. There will be another Cabinet Committee involved, and that is the Rural Development Committee.

But as the plans are approved, and obviously dependent upon the level of decision making, that is a policy plan or regional perspective, you may only have a certain segment, you may only have the A.D.M.'s involved. The plans that my particular section is involved in is the subregional as we started at the very bottom of this chart, and there is one more below us in terms of decision making levels, and that is the local level planning, you can certainly describe that later in our questions.

At this point in time, I will give you -- that is the present listing of initiatives or planning projects that we have underway. This large group under here called

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

subregional would basically be the ones that my section is responsible for. We have a regional, obviously the Eastern Slopes plan up here, and a number of local grazing reserve initiatives. There are seven subregional plans in the Eastern Slopes planning, four plans, active plans in the northern boreal area, and the remaining plans are either on the whole pattern such as Fort Assiniboine, the area over on Cold Lake, are on hold at the present time.

To give you a perspective on the public lands involved, it involves only Crown land, not private land, this is another important element. So from these plans as part of the preparation today, I have reviewed the material on these plans that are within our purview, and this is a list of some of the recreational issues which I feel are -- this is perhaps not the full list, certainly there is enough room here to add, but I think one of the principal elements of concern in the management responsibility for recreation, recreation development is undergoing a significant shift in achieving its objectives. Public sector resources in terms of manpower and budget are being increased, the private sector is being encouraged.

The principles, by the way, which we are moving towards, very specifically under strong direction from the senior executives of the departments, and I think you can see that not only in the element of recreational development, but in all aspects of resource management. This, although it is germane to the area of recreational management, is also very applicable to other resource considerations. It is quite obvious the conflicts which are going to be evident when we look at that kind of shift as well as look at the interface between this resource under that kind of a regime and other resources under a similar type of regime for development.

In our plans we have a number of -- I have broken them down into a number of categories, we have water based problems, lake management plans. The lakelands integrated management plan that is in the northern boreal areas have a

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Short)

high proportion of lakes, particularly in the lakeland plans, which need farther follow-up after the planning activities that we do at a more detailed level. Those are within the Green Area, at the present time we are not too sure who is going to produce those. Environment has a stake in it, Public Lands has obviously a stake, Municipal Affairs is very much involved in private lands, land based areas with lakes in them in the development of lake management plans. So that has to be resolved and sorted out.

River access to recreational use is a study presently going on in the southern region of the province for access to Oldman and Castle Rivers. Cottage subdivision considerations, local initiatives or provincial initiatives to provide additional subdivision cottaging for public is raising a profile in our plans. Back country interests, ecological reserves, natural areas, wildlife recreational areas and wilderness recreational areas; these all have an element of development injected into almost every one of our plans, and particularly the Eastern Slopes' plans. A lot of new initiatives on the ecological reserves programs right now, and trying to be brought underneath the scope of the I.R.M. planning.

Tourism; tourism demands for commercial development, I have just quickly noted that. Obviously an increased element of involvement there, much of that related back to this thrust change here. And access, recreational users should be A.T.V.'s and designated routes concepts, some of you are well aware of, and obviously the administrative mechanism have got to be delivered to really deal with such things as forest land use and et cetera.

Very quickly then, Miss Chairman, this is a list of what I know to be some of the issues of recreational interest in the Eastern Slopes, in the Green Area, I should say. From that I will turn it over to the next speaker.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Thank you very much, Paul. Diane,

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Pachal)

would you mind going next?

MS. PACHAL: Good morning ladies and gentlemen, as Louise mentioned as she opened the session that recreation-related environmental problems is a very broad subject, I will touch on some things that should stimulate some comment and some interest.

First of all, I am going to take some excerpts from scenarios that essentially describe a situation that has been repeated a number of times in our Green Zones to varying degrees, and some of you may be thinking of places this could apply to. In 1892 Alpine Lakes, Little Kachess and Big Kachess were accessible only by game trails and were used infrequently by people. The lakes were connected by trout filled streams rich in wildlife, growth of trees which were many hundreds of years old were interspersed throughout the area. Human impacts were virtually non-existent, only a few people entered the people for recreational activities. Hunters and a few trappers were known to use the area on occasion. The Kachess area offered a true wilderness opportunity for those wishing to use it.

In the early 1900's a dam was constructed, and for the next several decades the roads that had been used for building the dam and for logging the area was expanded facilitating motorized access to recreational opportunities. Evidence of the use became obvious as people camped and played along both lakeshores and several streams that emptied into a recently completed lake. The primeval conditions that once characterized Lake Kachess were no longer present, but people came looking for some primitive type of recreation and were apparently happy with what they found.

By the 1940's the use of Lake Kachess had increased markedly, and several camping areas had been established by the users. In response to these impacts, the agency responsible for making the area adjacent to the lake developed several sites that were heavily used for

recreation along the west side of the lake. The roads were improved and rustic tables and outhouses were installed. The area, now much more developed, appealed to people looking for some of the conveniences of modern living. Most were apparently happy with what they found.

In response to rapidly growing recreation use, and the increased impact on resources, management agencies further modified the area in the early 1960's. Paved roads were developed within the campgrounds, a new camping area was constructed to accommodate the increasing number of travel trailers, and heavily used areas were closed to overnight camping. Most of the resemblance to the primitive area had disappeared by this time. Campers had the convenience of paved roads, modern toilets and running water. Campers seeking modern kinds of camping opportunities came in ever-increasing numbers, and were apparently happy with what they found.

The use increased, the area was further developed, and the campsites brought totals to nearly 200. More flush toilets, fireplaces, and concrete and wood tables were built. By the 1970's Lake Kachess resembled a modern, highly developed, intensively used recreation complex, readily accessible to large numbers of people. During the evolution of the recreational use, many fundamental questions were never asked or answered, such as what recreational use was the area best suited to provide? What kinds of recreation use was the environment capable of handling? What would be the short and long term environmental impact of those uses? What is the characteristics and preferences of the users of the area? How would the area fit into providing a spectrum of environmental settings and with recreation opportunities in a larger region? For example, that spectrum being one ranging from ecological reserves in wilderness areas through to highly developed landscapes.

Because such questions have seldom been answered, especially in the Green Zone, we now see today some of the

environmental problems associated with recreational use. To a large degree, recreation has been dictated by resource activities in the Green Zone, particularly the road systems and the seismic lines developed with those activities.

In looking at the recreational-environmental type problems that our association have been dealing with, we tend to group them into three categories, and maybe I will mention those to help you, again there is a large number of problems associated with recreation. One category related not specifically to the users themselves, but sometimes the problems are simply a result of lack of foresight on the part of agencies for managing or developing public lands. Quite often this relates to inappropriate or unnecessary development, and is often done under the guise of making the area more convenient for users.

Another category relates to cases where the type of use itself is environmentally acceptable in principle, but the people participating in recreation use tend to abuse or misuse the area.

In the third category environmental problems are a result of inappropriate type of recreational use occurring in the area. Now maybe I can give you some slides just to show a few examples.

The first category, cases where the land managers themselves have undertaken recreation developments that are not appropriate or in some cases unnecessary to the area. This is an area in the prime protection zone, and it is an area which in effect was a wilderness area, so things like horses or back-packing are accepted recreational uses. But in this case that line you see looks like a cut line run across the hill there is actually a horse trail that was built. Again another example, again a prime protection type area, again essentially a de facto wilderness area, most of these areas have had an amount of traditional use, meaning foot and horse use, throughout the area. This is what happened to that particular trail, and it became an

official trail, and again recreational development that wasn't that appropriate for the area.

One last example, this is again a de facto wilderness area, a trail was laid out so that people would essentially use the back country campsite that was built. Again, some scarring and so on occurring from that recreational development which was unnecessary for the area.

The second category, the types of uses that are environmentally acceptable in principle, but recreational users, some of them, which are abusing the area, this example is snomobiling use, and again it's an area that snomobile use can go on quite acceptably in principle, the problem is snomobiling when there is not enough snow, and that is not a dirt bike track, that is for snomobiles.

Another example from snomobiling, on the left is the horse trail through the area, on the right is the snomobile trail, and that is only after two seasons of use as far as snomobiling goes.

But it is not just the motorized uses using the back country, it seems to be non-motorized and motorized, and being in Banff you might be aware of some problems, garbage and such is unsightly, but you also have the giardia problem, it is throughout the Rockies and the U.S. and it's moving into Canada here, and it is not the beavers that are bringing it with them, it's the people and lack of just toilet training in the back country. And again, it's a very serious problem, because once the parasite is in the water system, it is essentially there for a very long time, and that's where the beavers do pick it up and can transfer it to other water systems as they move.

The third category relates to the type of recreational uses that are just not acceptable to particular areas or the objectives of that area, and this is one of the major concerns we spend a lot of time with now related to motorized use, especially helicopter use for back country skiing or for fishing. Again the main concern is this is a prime protection

zone which by policy is not for mechanized use. This use is occurring, and there is no specific policy in place right now to deal with that use, and the impact occurring from it. This is one of the helicopter landing areas in one of our high alpine lakes in an area that used to be classed as a wilderness area. What has happened here is people essentially denuded this hill. This hill used to look like the other one across the lake there, it's an area of the subalpine forest. In the area the trees have been cut both for fire wood and for getting the number of helicopter flights in, and people using it on a regular basis, the denuding of the vegetation occurs. What we can't see in the photo is the effect that kind of use has on fisheries in high mountain lakes. High mountain lakes are not that productive as far as fish go, they are cold and fish grow slow, when you get in some cases a hundred flights in on a weekend with fishermen, it doesn't take too long to damage that fishery, and as well, the effect that motorized use has on those local outfitting businesses that are set up for the area. Customers who are paying a fair price take a wilderness trip to a nice alpine lake for fishing, then have helicopters land on them throughout the weekend.

Other concerns, the motorized use throughout the Green Zone again in areas where it is not appropriate for the environmental conditions there even though again with the prime protection zone motorized use is not to be permitted by policy, in fact it is occurring over the past five years, and occurring at an alarmingly increasing rate. This is a typical camp back in a prime protection zone. The result of that type of motorized use, and again these are people following any place that you can get your vehicle through a forest, and following seismic lines or resource roads, and of course, this leads to erosion problems. What you can see is also some wildlife harassment problems as a result of extensive motorized use. By harassment, people sometimes get confused when you say harassment, they think you mean that

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Pachal)

people are intentionally chasing wildlife, but harassment can be unintentional because of the noise and activity of people in the area disturbing the wildlife. And again, we do have some productivity in that resource. Motorized use is also suppressing vegetation regrowth in areas. Some of you recall, especially on seismic lines, commercial forests are cut for seismic lines and you find motorized use here innibiting the regrowth of these seismic lines back into commercial sized trees is being hampered by motorized use.

Also one of the problems, there are a number of other areas that are being reclaimed by the use of public funds, because they are areas in a prime protection zone, or a critical wildlife zone, of the Green Area. But with few exceptions, there is nothing stopping people from driving over these areas. That is the same spot that following fall, so essentially all the work, a lot of the reclamation work has been laid to waste, and not just that done by the Heritage Trust Fund, but also work done by companies. People particularly in the oil and gas industry go in to do some work, for example, on the seismic lines, reclaim it and reseed it, and then come back the following year and see that all their work has essentially gone to waste.

I would stress that the solutions relate to a combination of three things, and I stress combination because one without the other isn't going to work very effectively. One is public education, one is appropriate management and appropriate legislation. With education we need to instill within the public wild land use ethics and sensitize them to the potential negative impact of their use. Again a lot of problems are occurring to a great extent simply over ignorance of users. Public education essentially right now, especially with motorized uses by the companies promoting motorized vehicles. You turn on the TV and see the sponsors, and you can essentially drive anywhere you wish. There is nothing counteracting that, no one seems to have gotten through to the companies. We do have a hunter education

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Pachal)

program in the Province which is attempting to educate those who hunt for recreation, and it is not reaching the other users of the Green Zone. To some extent there are park interpretation programs, but again they are not reaching all the people we need to reach.

In the aspect of environmental education, you just can't simply depend on organizations to pass the word, because most of the public out there using the Green Zone are not members of any particular club or organization.

Management, we require a conscious assessment in planning by land managers to answer some of those questions I outlined at the beginning, the Lake Kachess areas. Interest has started now through the use of the integrated management planning process which is now the integrated resource management, although there still are some difficulties often in the integrated resource management, guidelines and so on are not directly related to current land use decisions. Many are just sitting back and waiting till the planning is done and then they will start implementing some of the concerns. The other problem is, especially with groups that are concerned with non-motorized use in wilderness areas, there is no single agency you can put your finger on that is responsible for assessing the problems of potential wilderness areas for non-motorized recreation areas, and when it comes to the whole question of recreation, there is a number of agencies that have their finger in recreation, so it is pretty frustrating for someone in the general public to express recreation concerns and to bring those concerns in.

And finally, legislation, we require legislation to back up the planning policies. For example, legislation to back up our eastern slopes policy, and I will give you one example again related to motorized use, something that is occurring quite commonly are people with new A.T.V.'s going with chainsaws and widening up old horse trails and foot trails in prime protection zones so they can get their A.T.V.'s

through. And when people report these, the land managers essentially threw up their hands in frustration because the only thing they can do is if they catch them cutting green trees they can stop them, because there is a law prohibiting cutting of green trees within the Green Zone unless you have got a permit. But there is nothing stopping you from driving over reclaimed areas in the Eastern Slopes with a few exceptions. Again so far the legislation is that we have to enact forest land use zones so we are able to get that specific roads and seismic lines, and we are just starting that way now. But some areas of the province are very serious, and left unmanaged for another couple of years, it is going to take a long time to reclaim them.

So thanks.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Thank you very much, Diane, we have all got to work very hard on some of these issues. Eric told me on the way over that if he had known we were all Ph.D.'s, he never would have accepted the invitation. So all of you who are not Ph.D.'s, please raise your hands.

MR. BUTTERS: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman, I will see if I can put forward an agricultural perspective on this issue of recreation-related environmental problems. Speaking from our point of view, there are two types of Green Zones, a Green Zone that includes deeded land and Crown grazing leases, and there is a Green Zone that doesn't, which is predominantly forest reserve, and to all intents and purposes, there is very little to almost no recreation in let us say A.T.V. related environmental problems in the area held under grazing leases because the landowner in the case of private land, or the landholder in the case of grazing leases controls access. And few if any landowners or leaseholders will let the general public enter agricultural land to roar around indiscriminantly on motorized vehicles. Most landowners will allow responsible and accountable users to enter provided they observe certain conditions, for

instance, entry may not be allowed when roads and trails are wet or susceptible to damage, and users must stay on the trails and not drive up and down on hillsides or back and forth across streams. If conditions are ignored, I guess entry would not be granted to those individuals; so the accountability yields responsibility.

The greatest and most significant environmental damage in our opinion occurs on the forest reserve areas where there is no accountability. The recreational user is the only user on these lands who is accountable to no one, and upon whom no restrictions are placed, with the exceptions of Kananaskis Country and the three wilderness areas in the province.

Every other user, of course, is subject to rules and regulations that are designed to ensure, among other things, that environmental type concerns are adhered to. Other users I am referring to include agricultural users, timber users and oil and gas exploration activities and, or developers, and mineral developers. We are all required to abide by prescribed rules and regulations, and if we don't, we can be thrown out.

As an example close to home, I live west of Cochrane, there is a lot of seismic lines and forest reserves, some of these lines back when the oil business used to be booming would be shot two or three times a year, year after year. One of the lines, the forest service was environmentally sensitive and would not allow a seismic company to enter with any kind of machine, not even a four-wheel drive pick-up. So they had to move all their equipment and personnel by helicopter or else on foot. Of course, the seismic companies tend to work seven days a week and on the weekends these guys were almost being run down by dirt bikers who were going down the same line. The Forest Service has a hold on the seismic companies, but it doesn't have a hold on recreational users.

Some A.T.V. users are responsible and try to minimize

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Butters)

damage, certainly there are others who are not. The A.T.V. use and its effects on agricultural activities within the forest reserves, the predominantly owned agricultural use is summer grazing of cattle in areas that are suitable for that and on an annual permit basis. The A.T.V. abuse where they roar around and tear up the countryside is prevalent but pretty hard to quantify. Perhaps the livestock disturbance is also difficult to quantify, some users are responsible, some are not. I can think of an example that happened a year ago this past summer when a neighbor of ours lost his summer grazing allotment, he keeps a cowboy right on the lot where the cow camp is. Larry was driving and chasing some cows up a trail and along came a dirt biker that just roared right through the middle and spooked all the cows in the timber. So after a considerable effort, Larry managed to gather up most of the cows again and proceeded on his way up the trail, and this guy came back and roared through them again. I'm sure this fellow on the dirt bike couldn't have heard what Larry had to say over the roar of his machine, and the fact that he had a helmet over his ears, but I guess he could lip-read, because he came thundering back, pulled up beside Larry and invited him down off his horse to repeat what he just said. Larry obliged and the whole situation deteriorated from there.

I can think of another example of a particularly responsible user on our grazing allotment, three summers ago there was a grizzly bear that killed a few calves and I was up there with Fish and Wildlife officers helping them set some snares to try and trap and remove this bear. It was just getting dusk and we heard these two motorcycles coming down the trail, and presently they arrived where we were, so the uniformed Fish and Wildlife officer went up to them and said that we were trying to set snares to livetrap a killer grizzly that was likely nearby and would these guys please leave. You can't imagine how fast they left, a few seconds they were gone. So some of them are pretty good anyway.

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN
(Butters)

Provincial Government reaction to motorized use or abuse has been varied, I suppose. The A.T.V. use is almost entirely prohibited in Kananaskis Country, I guess they decided some of the recreational users in Kananaskis Country don't like having to put up with other recreational users in Kananaskis Country. I live in the area that has borne the brunt of this decision, and has channelled the A.T.V. use into the Ghost area which is just north of Kananaskis Country and built specific campgrounds at some considerable expense to cater to these users. One example is the Fallen Timber Recreation Area that is spending literally hundreds of thousands of dollars providing campgrounds and trails for the user. They seem to go to no ends and are quite willing to spend any amount of money to satisfy them. I know motorcyclists tend not to like going across bridges, they can go across streams, and of course, if you watch the motorcycle commercials on TV that is exactly what they are doing on TV.

So after some considerable study, the Provincial Government decided that was damaging to the stream beds and they didn't know what to do. The bikers wanted to go across the stream but it is hard on the habitat, so they installed some stretches similar to railway ties in the stream beds so the waters still flowed over them so the bikers could go across and it wouldn't wreck the stream too much. That is just an example, and I can't imagine what the cost of that would be.

Although the Provincial Government spends vast sums of money developing these trails, they are unwilling to designate these areas specifically and prohibit use elsewhere. I was just talking to the local forest ranger the day before yesterday and he was telling me that a motorcyclist came in right into their yard and roared around in the ranger station yard. They couldn't charge him with anything. Similarly I know of certain areas in the forest reserve where we run our cattle and they are quite sensitive. I can think of a sand dune area where vegetation is quite sparse, we call it the sand ridge. The motorcyclists have found it now and it will

soon be sand valleys, they have great fun roaring around there in the sand. The ranger can't do anything about it, he can just stand there and watch them.

So really all the Forest Service can do at the moment is watch, they really can't do anything with an abuser.

So in closing, Madam Chairwoman, if I were to be so bold as to make some recommendations, I think that there is no evidence, certainly ample evidence, to indicate that A.T.V. use is overwhelming, it's documented, and therefore I think that certain less fragile areas could be developed specifically for A.T.V. use, and some other areas be prohibited, particularly in that part of the year when the ground is not frozen and when it is susceptible to damage. I suppose the only other philosophical comment I might add to that is if there was some mechanism to ensure accountability of users, perhaps that might be a route to go. Perhaps a recreational lease to an individual user association, and then if they mess up they would be in the same situation as I find myself in a grazing lease, they would soon lose it. So with that, I will say thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Thank you very much Eric, I find myself wishing we had some of yesterday's people back here to be on the firing line. Before I throw it open to the audience, I wonder if any of you have any comments about what any of the others have said? Have we got some questions? Martha?

DR. KOSTUCH: I will leave the access to grazing leases to someone else. There are two specific environmental problems I would like comments on by the panel, are the Odyssey, uncontrolled vehicle access, particularly in the prime protection zone mentioned by Diane, but I would like Paul Short's comments on that. Mount Allan, and the logging in the upper Oldman and the effect that would have on the wildland recreation?

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Paul, do you care to comment on that?

MR. SHORT: I guess I had better. Yes, the Odyssey issue is part of the study area called the Nordegg-Red Deer. That plan itself right now going to what we call the Resource Integration Committee for review and approval. The actual issue of the Odyssey I am not up to making any statement on it. The plan itself, I believe, is dealing with it as a facility zone, or an area, and again I am in troubled water there because I don't have a specific comment to make on it.

The vehicle access question, a number of initiatives have been taken, and one of the points that I made on my total summation of issues at the very bottom was this A.T.V. use, and what somebody calls designated routes. There are initiatives in a number of areas on designated routes. A designated routes program is going to be a pilot area in the Brazeau Dam and the Rocky North Saskatchewan studies, and an element of the Nordegg-Red Deer studies. That will come out of a part of a recommendation on overall policy access concerns.

The Mount Allan issue I think right now the Kananaskis Country has dealt with that in a planning and financial basis, but that one I know is a little bit more specific about it. The zoning for that is to relate to the decision to protect the Zone 1 areas and provide for the designation of the Zone 1 and recognize the facility development that was proposed for that area. That is presently under the committee review, and Kananaskis Country itself is being debated for decision in January, and the Oldman area and the Livingstone-Porcupine Hills area, again zoning considerations, there are a number of factors there, there is the Beehive Ecological Reserve area which is part of that upper Oldman area, there is obviously areas of Zone 1 which does recognize the prime protection concerns. There is however Zone 5, which is my understanding will be involved in the harvesting programs in that area.

This area, during policy discussions with the R.I.C.

committee discuss the merits of that area versus the merits of the north end of the Porcupine Hills in terms of providing zoning configurations that will protect the wildlife/ recreational interest, which have been also expressed in the North Porcupine Hills. The decision has been made in concert with a lot of agencies involved, provincial parks, et cetera, that the North Porcupine will receive a Zone 4 designation and the area in the Oldman or upper Oldman will be retained under the zone configuration is what I have just described, 1 and 5, there is some 2's, and recognizing the fact that there is a proposed ecological reserve area.

So that, I hope, adequately answers your address to the questions that were raised.

MS. PACHAL: I have to comment on Martha's question. The Odyssey and Mount Allan have one thing in common, much like the scenario I described to you with a recreation facility that is planned to be put in place. The decision on that was made prior to some thorough environmental impacts and assessments of that recreation facility on the area, and that goes for both Mount Allan and Odyssey. I won't go into specifics of the environmental problems, but again, it is introducing a major recreational use into the area which, in looking at it, is from our groups, the area is not suitable for those types of recreation uses to that extent. The upper Oldman logging -- afterwards if you want to see me, I will tell you the whole story. But one concern is, although there is an integrated recreation management plan in process, the proposal, especially to allocate the increased drainage which is the drainage from the upper Oldman watershed that proposal to allocate it to timber harvesting is essentially bypassing the integrated management planning process. The allocation for harvesting was made in 1980 when the license was given to Revelstoke Company, and that license covers both prime protection and multiple use zones. The original plan had logging areas in both prime protection and multiple use when

they drafted it, so the second phase of logging which will be done in 20 years time is largely planned for prime protection zone, the first phase of the logging is planned for what is currently now multiple use zone. The whole major question is -- by the way a lot of the areas they are logging into is currently on the maps as protection forest, the major concern is this is the last sizeable watershed in the Eastern Slopes that hasn't undergone extensive development, resource development. It is essentially a de facto wildland area and is used extensively by southern Albertans because of its attractiveness and the wildland recreation opportunities, and to some extent by tourists too. If we use this area as a wildland area, that means the only area where people can go for a weekend and travel through the area and not see large clear cuts or not see a major oil and gas field in Alberta would be Waterton National Park. Waterton National Park essentially is not large enough, it is being used to capacity since 1973 and people are turned away at campgrounds and you can't get back country permits So essentially there is a high recreation demand down there and if you use that area, where can these people go, perhaps B.C., Montana, Kananaskis Country, or out on to the Crown grazing lease which would be a concern of ranchers in the area.

MRS. GOODWIN: Mary Goodwin from Environment Protection. I just want to speak on the topic of snomobiling again. I don't know anything about bikes, we don't have any bikes, and of the other motorized vehicles we keep on our own property. We have snomobiles on our property that come in on the river, so we have people using our property, so we try to see both sides of the fence. I feel that we let them come on our property as long as they respect it and try to look after it and we fence the river, so if they come they are just going up the river and not coming on to our land. But as far as touring on the Eastern Slopes, we haven't been touring for the past three years, and the main reason is a

lack of snow. We don't feel that there is enough snow cove... And I feel you could, or I would make a recommendation that you use this as a barometer on whether you let the snomobiles in. I feel if there's adequate snow cover, they are really not going to do that much damage. But I think it's rather pointless for people to be in there if there is very little snow.

DR. HACKLER: A question for Mr. Short -- Jim Hackler of the Science Advisory Committee, you have outlined a fairly rational or early process of making recommendations and developing plans, but supposing you were given a political decision from above which is uneconomic, irrational and inappropriate economically, environmentally and rationally, then your whole process becomes kind of a charade, and then of course it threatens your credibility in the eyes of people who are somewhat knowledgeable about the area. I think it is very genuine concern, how does one cope, how does the civil service cope with incompatible demands from above after going through a process which is supposed to appear rational and logical and reasonable to the public?

MR. SHORT: In terms of the ability to answer specifically what would I do, or what would we have to do, part of having the system concept in place, what we are facing, what we have faced a number of times are very arbitrary policy decisions which can not be measured against any barometer of good or bad. I think the presentation points which were made by Diane on the ad hoc decisions which flows down are just as likely to occur, but for which they will be far more accountable in terms of being able to rationalize, and I use the term rationalize by saying you can't have rational decisions which no one ever agrees with, but they are rational in someone's eyes. If the Minister so decides that there needs to be some initiative taken, being accountable to some body, that body being the Cabinet Committee of Economic Resources and Development Committee, I think that the system is able at any time, and the public

are able through the system to bring a question to the validity of that policy statement that the Minister or whoever has taken. Certainly, you were able to do that before, and I think as Diane also pointed out, there really wasn't any agency, anybody who would champion your cause, and you were lost in the milieu of a bureaucracy which is pretty oppressive sometimes in terms of dealing with people's concerns. The system is put in place to provide the vehicles to get those questions and accountability out of Ministers, out of Deputy Ministers, out of any of the other of the civil servants. The civil servants, we are honor-bound, as far as I am concerned, to follow the kinds of directions which are given to us.

DR. HACKLER: But don't you find yourself in a situation where civil servants are sent out to take the heat and flak while the Minister doesn't have to respond, and the civil servant has no control over the decision. It seems to me there is a situation where, especially the lower civil servants can get caught in a very unreasonable bind that they are sent out to give information, they have information meetings, but they can not question, they can not even take back a recommendation and say look, there is something that should be changed.

MR. SHORT: Traditionally I would agree with you, but right now with our planning facilities in line, there is a direct linkage now that the public will be able to, through the planning activity in a particular area, have access directly through the planner to the Minister. Right now there are two plans which are complete to the Deputy Minister level, we are now going to open public meetings in these two plan areas, the report coming out of those meetings will be put on the Minister's desk, that I would say has more direct accounting possibilities, it doesn't ensure anything, but it is a more direct opportunity.

DR. HACKLER: Could I get the planners for the Blackfoot Reserve sometime?

MR. SHORT: Sure.

MRS. BROADBENT: I'm Dorothy Broadbent, with the Environment Protection Study Group. With regard to the integrated resources plan, what mechanisms are in place for an ongoing public involvement, and the public have been involved up to this present time have done it at their own expense and at their own time and it has been a hardship on them. I think it should be pointed out that I don't really think that sort of public involvement really is, it doesn't involve a whole overall broad spectrum of the public, just narrow individual groups have been involved, and as I say, it has been at the public's own initiative almost.

MR. SHORT: In response to that, the history of the planning activity to date much reflects the changed attitudes that we have with the, when I say we and the government's approach involved, the information I set out on the history in 1975 or 1976 we began to get more involved in the integrated resource management approach. At that time the public involvement program basically was one where we depended upon the agencies who were supposed to be the management responsible agencies for the public needs to garner that kind of public requirement. Forestry to make sure they had their interests met from the public inquiry, Parks for instance where they get the demand consideration that were a part of their projections for the implementation of the plans, obviously they come from a user section of the public. We expected that kind of information to come through.

Also coming out of the '76 E.C.A. reviews of the Eastern Slopes and the subsequent decision for the Eastern Slopes policy I think a 14-volume text of submissions from the procedures that came through, and those were used in that time as a principal source for the kind of monitoring measures of the public's interest in that location. Since then however, we have moved in a continuum, we have moved from recognition of what I have just stated to specific public interest groups, we have formed an A.I.P.A.C. Committee,

an Alberta Integrated Public Advisory Committee, which is a key group, which right now has two new members, the Trialta and the Coal Association and I believe the AMA is on there as well. And indeed what we are moving towards is getting the public involvement right from the very beginning. So we are not, when I outlined the process that we have there, the public in some of the plans have had a poor role, and I will admit that openly in the kind of expectations that I think the public is wanting to have in these plans. We are opening that up. Right now the Bear River-Wapiti plan which we have just created this year in response to the needs of the Grande Prairie Town Council is -- well yesterday they had the first open house meeting, and that was before the terms of reference were created, before anything has been finalized on that. Anything that has really proceeded other than getting the government people to be prepared for the plan itself.

At the same time in saying that I have also described the open house meetings with the plans which are in place now, that has been completed, and the same continuation we have public consultants on the other plans which are kept up to date, and we are moving more towards open house meetings as well.

MRS. BROADBENT: Why has the concept of wildland recreation been rejected, it seems to me the public has done a lot of work, and a segment of the public are very knowledgeable in these areas, and this whole concept has been rejected; why?

MR. SHORT: I believe that one of the points they also pointed out was the need for back country areas, and you remember one of the categories I had was indeed the wildland recreational areas. The wildland recreational areas has to be fitted in with wilderness areas, with ecological reserves, with natural areas concerns. I believe there is nine, did you say nine wilderness areas which were submitted in 1976 E.C.A. hearings, information meetings?

MRS. BROADBENT: No, not wilderness areas, wildland areas.

MR. SHORT: Wildland areas, I'm sorry. They were submitted in those, at that point in time, never had, as I think Diane pointed out, a key agency which would take an initiative with those and promote them through the system. Or if they were in place, the level of review that they would receive without an integrated approach was rather sectorial, and received perhaps very little priority. This is supposition because I'm not, as I said at the beginning of the outline, directly involved with the administration of the recreational resources or any resources, our planning system is away from that and bringing those extras to the planning program. There is nothing to say that there won't be a wildland recreational area, but is it integrated with a wilderness area, a wilderness recreational area, a forest land use zone which is to be specifically designated as a wildland recreational focus, it is the mechanism, I don't think we rejected that mechanism. I think what we want to try to ensure is that the principles of wildland recreation, or the purpose of wildland recreation as an objective is identified, and then find the most appropriate means of dealing with that. If it is a wildland recreational area, then that may be the means, the way that that will be applied.

MRS. BROADBENT: I just have one more comment, you were telling us the public are allowed to participate, but it seems that the public are allowed to react to your plans, and I don't feel as a member of the public, as a participant, that I really have been able to participate in the preparation, that I have just reacted to the prepared plans and been able to give a little sort of tidying up of the end result.

MR. SHORT: Certainly in terms of individuals that we could take from all of the participants that we have had in the plans, their amount of sway in the planning is

different for each person. I know personally that the input we received on the Big Bend area from individuals from the I.D. Council were successful in changing what was originally a policy for multiple use into a policy for increased agricultural expansion. So to measure your concerns against someone else's, we could be here all day, I can show you one, I can show you another.

MRS. BROADBENT: Just one more comment, I am concerned about the cottage subdivision proposal, how big do you see them?

MR. SHORT: I have no idea specifically, I think maybe the first will be on the lake areas, but there is already a cottage subdivision program for lakes in Alberta, whether they will expand that significantly I don't know, whether they will move into the Eastern Slopes in a dramatic fashion I don't know. I know that they are moving positively towards providing opportunities for cottage subdivisions currently, but the extent of that again, part of that problem in recreation is putting it into perspective. Where is the policy in the Provincial Government weighed against the recreational needs and weighed against the wilderness needs, and a policy base which is perhaps politically enforced has to have within a system can be achieved. Other than that, I don't know, I think you would probably find, if you were wondering whether wildland recreation areas are ten years from now.

MS. HEDENSTROM: I am Joanne Hedenstrom from the Pollution Study Group. I have two points that I would like to make, the first one is a point, I think, and the second one is a question that I would like to direct to Diane. My first point is that I really am pleased to hear from two citizens here who represent citizen groups, and I find it really refreshing to have someone like Diane or Eric to comment on the direct problems in the area. I think in another year I think there might be far less from the government agencies and planning people and much more from

people like Diane and Eric. I think the last speaker made a comment which is quite appropriate when she said that civil servants usually have to give rather general answers because they are in a position of accountability, and we sometimes don't get satisfactory discussions, we get general answers and we get deferred from discussion topics and that sort of thing. I would like to see more citizens and citizens' groups here talking to you because it gets to the actual problem.

The other thing is I would like Diane to comment on the Alberta Wilderness Association's difficulty in getting input to the integrated management plan and give us a history of their attempts to be a part of that process, and if she would like to comment on their attempts to be a part of the planning process as a whole in Alberta, and maybe she would comment on the appropriateness of a key agency versus a citizen group, a citizens' group is cheaper, and very often very knowledgeable. And if the government is attempting to cut down on costs I think a high use of citizens' groups rather than forming new agencies deploying the lack of key agencies to take up the costs or the wilderness or wildland recreation, I think government might take more advantage of citizens' groups and cut some corners. Thank you.

MS. PACHAL: I will try and briefly answer that. It began with, as far as our involvement began with two things,one we found out the East Slopes policy was being revised internally, we were told that this was a refinement, but we wanted the refinement defined so we knew what was going to happen with the Eastern Slopes policy. And also in asking those questions found that the integrated management planning process which policy itself specifies was to occur had indeed started, and we had asked for input into this policy and were told to speak with our MLA. Of course there is difficulty in the MLA's being elected representatives and they are very busy people and often do not have the background or expertise on specific concerns. Rather than always

walking into our MLA's office, we pursued through a long series of correspondence to outline the benefits of public involvement and how we could essentially help in the process and make it more efficient. One of the principles you have to remember that these policies are about public land and they are public policies, so it is the public in the end that will be using them and benefitting from them. So you might as well have the public involved, otherwise you could be faced with a situation where the civil service have designed a policy which they feel is correct being somewhat out of touch with the public, winding up with a policy that is not acceptable by the public. So in the end, people essentially saw the light and we also gave examples of public participation process, which has gone on for a number of years in Parks Canada, Western Region, which started off not much different from this provincial public input and integrated management planning program, started off with lots of fights and arguments and so on, but soon evolved into a worthwhile process and the bottom line is we wound up with some effective planning and some good plans in the end.

The problem as far as the Wilderness Association goes, and again as I said in my presentation, there is no agency in this province which was actively assessing the problems for potential wilderness or wildland recreation areas, and then in turn managing these areas, even though in the East Slopes hearings it became very evident that about 65 percent of Albertans supported having areas called wildland recreation areas, areas of essentially wilderness quality lands where no motorized use of the lands or resource activities could not occur. The difficulty with the integrated management plans themselves when they started out was that the wilderness iteself and wildland recreation areas are not recognized as a resource when the terms of reference were put out. Our major concern was not considered in the terms of reference. So from that point on, we had to first convince people on the planning team that

wilderness is a resource, and secondly that there is a demand for that resource, and it needs some management and we need some areas in the province. And that is the state that it is currently at, the wildland recreation areas are there, but it has become very frustrating for people planning on the management teams on the integrated management plans, first of all there is no one on the planning teams representing their concerns, secondly when it does get to you, you see that because the terms of reference are set up wilderness is shoved off and somehow defined under recreation, so then we do get into problems like the upper Oldman area where currently there is a planning going on, but wilderness is not recognized as a resource within that plan, and therefore the upper Oldman is not being discussed within that plan.

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: I don't know if I am allowed to do this, but I would like to make one comment in response to Joanne's comment. I agree partially with you, but I think it behooves us all here to be more effective to understand the policies and the problems that are in place right now. Do we have any more questions?

DR. BUCKMASTER: Harvey Buckmaster from S.A.C. I would like to make one comment, and then I'd like to throw out to this group, and then I would like to make a specific observation about the topic we have been talking about this morning. The point that I think we have been dealing with that we haven't come to grips with with all park issues is the conflict that exists between two types of person that come to use parks, whether it is in national parks or at the other extreme in wilderness areas, et cetera, and that is the difference between a tourist and a traveller. I would expand on that if anybody wants to at some other stage, but at this stage I would like to say that the problem that people have in the public participation process is that we are always within the focus of discussions forced to react, that government seem to prefer to put the opposition in that position, and they really do not believe in public participation in the

true healthy sense. I have had at least one pretty positive experience which I played the role in the formulation of the policy, and it concerns a topic that a good many Calgarians that are interested in environmental issues are familiar with, and that is the master plan for Nose Hill Park, which we still don't have all the land for, but we do have the planning for it. When the City got to the stage of deciding how to do the planning on it, they were going to put out a master plan proposal, and they were going to ask the citizens of Calgary to react to it. I managed to get them to develop three alternative development proposed master plans for Nose Hill, and these went out to the public, and the public had a chance to look at what one might call three different scenarios, one of which was virtually an absolute minimum development proposal, one had a small amount and the third one had a considerable amount of development in it. Well, when the public hearings had been finished on this, people had the opportunity to think about what alternatives were, what they liked about the various alternatives and they could do their own fine-tuning. The consequence of that process was that the vast majority of residents that participated rejected the higher development scenario, they even rejected most of the middle development proposal which was pretty sensitive, and in fact they said lookit, we'd like a few of the things in the middle development one, but we really want the minimal development one. It was then very easy for the civil servants to do their job. I think the problem that civil servants are put into is that they are forced to come out with one proposal and then defend it. Whereas if they always have the opportunity of presenting a number of alternatives which they could then explain to the public at public hearings, they would not be put in this terrible box which I think we are all more than sensitive to. And if I was to carry that further, I think this group could quite likely and reasonably make a resolution that if governments go into public hearings on specific proposals they should

come forward with maybe three alternatives with the rationale for all of those alternatives. Thank you.

DR. HACKLER: If I could continue a little bit on that theme, I think Harvey has pointed out a very important aspect of a different style of administration in government, in fact some of this in certain areas is called an auditor model versus a contingency model, but in this contingency model the job at the lower levels of this procedure is encouraging people to expose different viewpoints, alternatives that usually exist within those ministries, say, for example, I'm sure that in all of your ministries you have people who will have different approaches, opinions, and they will be debated within. In some governments those debates are made public, and other governments they are not made public, they are essentially one strategy is followed. Now I personally think it is much healthier if we could get those particular debates where the expertise is quite often within the hands of the civil servants who have been working on it for a number of years and let them expose their own differences to the public. I'm not sure that the public is always able to provide the balance that the people can who have been working with these problems for a number of years. And it would seem to me that if civil servants were encouraged by the ministries above to pour out a wider variety of the dilemmas they are facing, I think we would give greater credibility to the final plans if they finally end up being compromised, admittedly, but I guess the feeling is that in this Provincial Government there is a tendency not to engage in that type of a process which makes civil servants caught between the rock and a hard place very often.

I think some sort of resolution from this group, not so much on specific issues, but on the way in which we might dialogue with the government I think would be a very positive sort of feature.

MR. SHORT: If I could, the A.I.P.A.C. Committee

has had an opportunity to review the system, when I say A.I.P.A.C. Committee I will very briefly outline it to you, it is made up of -- I'll try to run them off, Alberta Wilderness Association, Alberta Fish and Game Association, Alberta Stockgrowers Association, Western Stockgrowers Association, Unifarm, Alberta Forest Products Association, Alberta Coal Association, AMA, and that association has had a chance to go over the -- oh, the CPA/IPAC, correct, have had a chance to go over the systems document which I just very quickly outlined, and had made a number of recommendations. We have had a public forum where we brought the representatives on the team from those A.I.P.A.C. bodies, because each one of those A.I.P.A.C. bodies by the way has a representative on the planning program for each of the planning areas. They designate the individual and that person is contacted through the process as it's developed. Certainly there is improvements to be made, and quite frankly they are being made. So they have had a review of this, they have come up with some recommendations, then reviewed that document back in front of that body, that A.I.P.A.C. body, now the whole of that A.I.P.A.C. body basically is policy reviewing group to I think look at a lot of the initiatives which are going to come out on either specifically the integrated resource management system. I think you need to express some of the broad specifics, but one of the other principles we are trying to ensure, we are trying to get the policy level decisions to be made in an environment of cooperation and participative approach with the public as a vehicle to give us the directions. I think if you examined, and I'm not too sure who the previous speakers were in your meeting, to look for and express provincial recreational policies you will not find them. Only last year the Fish and Wildlife Division created a provincial policy for fish and wildlife. There isn't a provincial forestry policy as stated as such, nor is there a mineral resource development policy as stated as such. It is

the need to move towards these broader scope decisions provincially and regionally within the management scheme we have proposed is achievable. The plans we have got in place now, the bulk of them, the subregional plans have been injected into the decision making continuum that has been historically the case where we have argued and a time line is taken for creation of these plans, very exhaustively. But what we end up inevitably arguing when we sit down with either the public or government groups is the policy as it applies to that particular area, and we are moving now through the forest to the planning to get those policies recognized and brought out into a forum where the politicians and the civil servants and the public, A.I.P.A.C. especially, are going to have a chance to look at it.

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: I was going to cut it off, but is it important?

MR. WHISTANCE-SMITH: I just want to make one comment on something. Some years ago, I can go back ten years ago now to the early '70's, the problem which we heard described by Eric with the A.T.V.'s seemed to apply to snomobiles, snomobiles were running everywhere at will and doing a great deal of damage; and a concern was expressed about this at the hearings on the Eastern Slopes and the then Minister of Culture and Recreation decided that rather than just go to legislation to stop all this he would bring these people together and express to them the concerns that were coming out of these hearings and that he was receiving in his office, and as a result of this, I'm speaking largely from impression more than hard facts, there seems to be a good deal of self-regulation took place with in the snomobiling communities. And I am wondering whether or not that could happen with the A.T.V. user community as well instead of just looking for straight regulatory routes to a solution.

MS. PACHAL: As I mentioned before, part of the difficulty is that like we have met with the Alberta Four-Wheel Drive Association, and those associations themselves are quite concerned about the damage that is occurring out there and don't sanction it for the members. But the problem is most people are not members of these groups, so the problem in this case is reaching all those that are not members of these associations. With snomobiling, I think one thing that has helped too is the number of users in the forestry reserve areas probably dropped, I don't know if there is any statistics to prove that, but what often happens when a new mechanized type of recreation comes out, it's use is quite high because of all the advertising and so on, and lowers down to a more acceptable level, and I imagine we have seen that happen now with snomobiling. Plus in the Calgary area I know what has happened there this past years of low snowfall, people haven't been snomobiling as much, or they are going to skiing, some of them are doing that. But with the four-wheel drives especially the type of damages that are occurring now I don't think we can just rely on peer pressure. That is part of the answer, but we need much more, especially when you have got cases where we are spending money on reclaiming areas and that work is essentially being laid to waste.

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: I want to thank all our panel very much for a very informative session, thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRWOMAN HORSTMAN: Please stay seated while Ken gives you some announcements.

MR. NELSON: I know that some of you are interested in the water management model, I understand that people who are operating that will be present in the room across the hall about 2 o'clock this afternoon. We should, I think, be wound up by that point, unless there is some emergency arises in the meantime. So I would be interested to see, and perhaps you could show me with a show of hands how many of you might be interested in taking part in that water management model exercise this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Ladies and gentlemen, could I have your attention. To continue with the other portion of our program, and for this program I will call on Bill Flook to carry on from here.

MR. FLOOK: Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce your luncheon speaker for today. To most of you, Alistair Crerar needs no introduction. To the rest of you, I am sure you are already getting to know him through the ease and informality of these meetings.

Although, undeniably, a rather modest person, Mr. Crerar's uncompromising position and very humane approach to environmental matters made him something of a symbol of environmental protection to a large number of people all over Alberta. It has, to my personal knowledge, made him an object of respect, if not envy, to his opposite numbers in most of the other provinces of Canada.

By training, an economist, Mr. Crerar has practiced his profession, both as economist and planner to governments at the municipal as well as the provincial and federal levels throughout Canada. He was, for instance, Director of Long Range Planning Division to the City of Toronto from 1962 to 1965. He was Manager of Atlantic Regional Planning for the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, located in the maritime provinces, from 1965 to 1972. He was Director of the Environment and Land Use Committee Secretariat of the Province of British Columbia from 1972 to 1977 before he assumed his present position with the Government of Alberta.

Ladies and gentlemen, now completing his sixth year as Chief Executive Officer of the Environment Council of Alberta, it is my pleasure to introduce my boss, Alistair Crerar.

(APPLAUSE)

MR. CRERAR: Thank you very much, Bill. Any of you who have spoken in this particular location will know that they have a little place to put your water glass and space provided, it is a very handy feature, and I have one

here. Now, I, having had that introduction, I'm always going to get myself introduced by my subordinates. Thank you very much, Bill. I think he was telling the truth, but I can only agree with it.

This will be my seventh report to the Joint Annual Meeting of P.A.C. and E.C.A. I have just completed, as Bill said, my sixth year as the Chief Executive Officer, but I addressed this meeting once before I became the Chief Executive Officer, before I came to Edmonton. We were holding a meeting in Red Deer, and it was right in the middle of all the controversy about the authority and the Council, and they wanted me to come to the lion's den, or the hornet's nest, or whatever you want to call it, with my eyes wide open; and in fact it was Charlie Wood who phoned me in Toronto and invited me to come out to see this bunch of orangutans who were meeting in Red Deer and just see what the situation was like.

Now, one of the things that is quite noticeable is that there are only a few faces that I remember from 1977, I think it was in November and there was a terrible snowstorm driving down from the airport down to Red Deer, the P.A.C. group didn't bother me, but the weather sure did. I was very, very shocked by that. But then I was encouraged by the fact that, I think it was Margaret, that drove me down there, and she was wearing open-toed shoes; and I thought that anybody that could wear open-toed shoes when the temperature was about minus 25 and the snow was coming down was either daft or was very hardy, and therefore was good stock to work with.

The point I was starting to make was that outside of probably Charlie and Chris, and Dorothy I think was in and went out and came back in again, a few faces like that, a few names, you are almost all new. You may not remember the controversy of that time. I think it is good to have that kind of renewal. One of the things you will notice in that we lost, a Bill read out that number of people that we lost this

particular year. Well that means we are going to get 25 new people coming in, so we have a changing kind of group that reflects new concerns and repriorization of old concerns.

Now, about the repriorization of old concerns, I will return to that themea little later by reiterating a concern that I expressed in my second address tc you, when I was in Edmonton, I believe, and I believe that outside of those few that I have identified, I think most of you are probably new so it is probably worth telling you again.

However, before that, I think I owe you a personal report. I don't particularly like talking about myself, I find it difficult to believe that many find the topic fascinating, however, this time is an exception. On July 23rd, a Saturday, I just finished my supper, a couple of hamburgers I think, with everything, and was watching a football game. It wasn't even a very exciting football game because it was Toronto versus Montreal, as I remember. But I began to get what I thought was indigestion, and thought I had a terrible case of heartburn with a pain in my chest that was going down my arms. I got up between periods and took some Rolaids, but that didn't really help. When I got up to get a couple of more Rolaids, my wife asked me if I was all right. I said I had terrible indigestion and was getting some more Rolaids because the first hadn't worked. She asked me where the pain was, I described it, and she said, "You don't have indigestion, you are having a heart attack." I said, "You're kidding, exaggerating, being an alarmist because you have angina and you want company", or something like that.

So she called a doctor friend of ours, described my symptoms, and he said yes he will call the emergency at University Hospital for Mary Lou to take me there right away. Well, she did, and I did have a heart attack, a myocardial infarction, called M.I. because it is so difficult to pronounce.

Now, the heart attack that I had was described by the

doctors as "if you had to have a heart attack, this was the best kind to have." It was mild to moderate, not severe; it was anterior, not interior, I'm not quite sure what that means, but that is what they told me. They likened it to a shot across the bow, a warning, and essentially a warning to change my lifestyle. Fortunately, I did have a few bad habits. It would be just terrible if I had a heart attack now, because it is like some of those Russian stories where you are going across the steppes in a Troika, you have grandma there and you are followed by packs of wolves, Fortunately you have grandma because then you can throw her off to the wolves and the wolves will pause with her. Well, that is what I have been able to do with cigars. I am sure the smoking of cigars, even modest Dutch cigars which I use doesn't go with the image of clean air and clean water. I gave them up cold turkey. And just after I laid in a supply at the old lower cost. Indeed, if you would like to obtain some at the old lower cost, see Giacomazzi because I couldn't bring myself to throw them out; Scottish nature and all that, and I didn't want to have them around because the temptation would have been too great. But I haven't had one since then, I do sometimes go close to people that are smoking one and sniff very deeply, but that's allowed.

I also lost some weight, about 20 pounds, and I am having my suits taken in so that I am reminded by the fac that if I am starting to bulge my suits out if I start putting on any more weight, and that's a very good reminder, you sort of get your suits cut to your new svelte figure, and then every time you put on more weight there's an instant reminder, get back sort of thing. I am also trying to cut back on my workload, and my work hours, but it is difficult in the middle of a public hearing; but they don't last forever.

In any event, I think I can report to you now that I am in excellent health, that I have had no recurrence of heart trouble, that I take no medicine for my heart, that I require

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK
(Crerar)

no surgical operations. That all I have to do is keep off cigars and fatty foods, and keep exercising and so forth to stay around for a few more years yet, and I hope to be reasonably effective.

I don't believe that I have ever reported to a Joint Annual Meeting right in the middle of a hearing, and if our calculations had been accurate, the public hearing part of the process would have been over. However, we underestimated the enthusiasm of the public, we had allotted three days, Monday to Wednesday of this week, yes it is this week, but that was not enough. We will have to go back for Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday next week to complete the hearings. We have now heard from something like 240 or 250 briefs. If you had told me two months ago that I would be hearing new things at this stage after hearing from 250 people and organizations, I would have said you were daft. But we are hearing new things. People in different locations have differing views on the same subject. They have different suggestions on how to solve the problems, that is the problem of the maintenance and expansion of agricultural land. And the suggestions we are getting are innovative and inventive. There is a wonderful well-spring of ideas and approaches that are coming out of the public hearing process.

It reinforces my belief in the process as it is practiced by the Environment Council. It is not a gladiatorial event with the lions eating the Christians, people are bringing forward their thoughts and their ideas, their cares and concerns, so that we as a panel can take them into account and develop solutions and recommendations. They are also bringing in, and this is terribly important, insights, innovative ideas, different kinds of things that range from -- well I can't even give you the range or I would be here for the rest of the day.

Before our next meeting, we should have the panel's report and recommendations published, and you will see what we have made of all this.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK
(Crerar)

Finally, to turn back to the theme that I discussed at my second meeting with P.A.C., and that theme is credibility. I think it is essential to achieve any impact from advice, that the advice be reasonable and credible. Shouting, screaming or marching may have some impact, but I don't think it has as much impact as a carefully thought out, carefully rehearched, persistently promoted viewpoint. I have no problem with P.A.C. tackling any environmental subject or topic as long as it does so responsibly and it doesn't react to a newspaper report with only one side of the story. There are usually at least two sides, sometimes more, and frequently more complications than the first report indicates. You really have to get enough background to be able to know what it is you're getting into.

The reason that P.A.C. is able to attain the kind of public and media attention that it does, is because of the responsibility and credibility that you have developed. Now that is a precious asset, don't throw it away or squander it, because it is difficult to get it back, and it is hard to reconstruct.

So that is my return to old themes. However, it bears repeating in today's atmosphere and climate. The critics of environmentalists are being emboldened. They are looking for evidence that environmentalists are irresponsible, calling for the impossible, saddling society with bureaucratic red tape and bureaucrats. We know that is a bad rap. There certainly are environmentalists and environmental groups that are responsible, that demand the impossible, that would saddle us with excessive control and red tape and expenditures; they do exist. You have to try and steer that line between true concerns and trying to get something that is feasible to be done without losing the dream, without losing the objective, without losing the goal that we all should share, which is a better environment.

Now, the accusation of irresponsibility is just not an accurate label to be applied to the Council's public advisory groups in my view. You are realistic, you are responsible, and because of that, you have impact. That is your strength and your trust, I hope you keep it that way.

Thank you very much.

MR. FLOOK: Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that Alistair's new feeling of rejuvenation will allow him to answer a few questions from the audience, if you wish.

MR. CRERAR: Why sure.

MR. FLOOK: Chris?

MR. DUNKLEY: I would be very interested to know what problems you perceive down the road that the E.C.A. are going to have to deal with in the way of public hearings?

MR. CRERAR: Well, the kinds of topics I think you probably, well P.A.C. has been making recommendations about topics that we should in fact engage in - air quality, public hearings on air quality. I would think we are probably at a stage where public hearings on water quality would make a good deal of sense. There is the possibility, and it keeps coming out in this conference of perhaps public hearings on outdoor recreation, to try and sort out who should be responsible for what, and try and find some answer to all, well I said paradoxes when I started, and I guess that terrible joke about the two ducks going over Winnipeg should have been two ducks going over Vegreville, but those are the kinds of things that I can see, Chris.

MR. SMITH: I am interested in public hearings, one of the biggest problems we seem to have in Alberta is that normal data that is available in other parts of the world, the chemicals in the water, the chemicals in the air, simply isn't available in Alberta, and I guess one of the weaknesses of this group, I am quite new to it, seems to be as soon as you ask for data it simply isn't available. I am concerned that we will have public hearings without an informed public, and in fact without the information that we

need to make rational decisions.

MR. CRERAR: Well, that is one of the strengths of our public hearing process. We try and get a topic identified and sufficiently far in advance that we can do some background research that will provide people with good, sound, and essentially unbiased and neutral advice. You know, we have on display in the Max Bell foyer there the 32 publications that we have developed for the agricultural land hearings. Now, 32 is a bit of an exaggeration, because half of those are summaries of major technical reports which are intended - the summaries - to be light and easy reading for your average person. If they are really interested in a particular topic, be it salinization or whatever it might be, they can go back to the original technical report and get all the details if they wish.

Part of the reason our hearings are good is because that information has been out there. We were delayed in getting into our public hearings this time, but that delay has turned out to be, I think, very advantageous because it meant we could get a better background on all of this. We started out thinking in terms of about eight major topic headings, and we kept adding one because people identified, well you haven't given enough consideration to research, or to the Federal Government, or to -- there were just all kinds of things that people would point out and we realized that we had deficiencies. And we got those things out for quite a long time before the hearings actually took place, and I think part of the reason that the quality of the participatants that are coming to us are so good is because that information has been out there for quite a while.

So, I'm not saying there is an absolute correlation between the length of time and the quality of the information but I think it is pretty significant that we are getting good stuff because this particular time we had more good background information developed than we have ever had before. I think that is the kind of secret, or part of the secret to having a

good public hearing. If you went into a public hearing without having any background information, as Mr. Smith is suggesting, I think it would be useless, all you would be getting is just off the top of the head. In fact, I remember Ken was saying that he was on a phone-in show trying to get publicity for our hearings in Calgary, and that was one of the suggestions that we in fact dispense with this whole public hearing charade and have everybody just phone in on one of those talk shows. Of course once you get on the talk shows, it's great, but it is just off the top of the head opinion. What we are looking for in the public hearing is partly that, sure, if that is what you have, but also the thought of you and your group sitting down and trying to wrestle with that particular problem and coming up with something interesting and new, and by golly they have. Any other questions?

DR. HACKLER: Two questions, and they are related; to what extent can your regular staff remain independent of the political process that you are going to have? And then secondly, is there anything that the Advisory Committee can do, let's say, to increase that independence or flexibility that seems to be important to this sort of council?

MR. CRERAR: Well, I think that's sort of - I know the staff, you can ask them, but I think we keep them shielded from political influence, or I keep them shielded from political influence. That's part of the role, I'm there, I'm there at pleasure, and that means that they can fire me tomorrow, but that's fine, I'm not that worried about it, and if you are, then you are not doing a very effective job.

If you start worrying about whether you're going to sail on long enough to get your pension, you might as well get out, and there's nothing much you can do about it as a P.A.C. group. It really is dependent on myself to try and keep the process as free as possible of political interference. If it isn't, then I don't think the process has much real effect, effectiveness I suppose, because then you would be getting,

it would be sort of like being in Echo Valley, you hear back what you want to hear, or what you have already said. We are doing wonderfully, we are doing wonderfully, you know, coming back from your advisory groups. The way it is now if I say we are doing wonderfully, the voice that comes back is no you're not. I am looking over at Martha.

MRS. KARIEL: You mentioned something about the effectiveness of P.A.C.; would you evaluate some of the more constructive things that have been done say in the last year because of P.A.C. that might not have happened otherwise?

MR. CRERAR: I really should turn that over to Bill Flook. Well, for one thing there were a number of presentations made by different groups, study groups in P.A.C. through our public hearing process, and that was very valuable. There were also submissions from individual members who are part of P.A.C. groups like Chris and Andy Wierenga, to our public hearing process that were very valuable. You know, that is part of the kind of assistance that you people provide.

I think in addition the kind of work that is being done, well I don't want to be invidious and single out any particular study group for sort of gold stars or silver stars, I think you know, or you should know what it is that you have done that has been effective. In fact that is something you should perhaps look at when you start your next year; what did we do last year that was effective? Why was it effective, and can we have more repetition of the things that were effective rather than those things that trailed away into the sand? Well, I wouldn't want to pick out any particular group without mentioning everybody, and then I get down to some group on the end and I say well they were just nice people or something like that.

MR. FLOOK: Anyone else? Thank you, Alistair.

MR. CRERAR: Thank you very much.

MR. FLOOK: I would like to ask Martha to come up and say a few words in appreciation.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK
(Crerar) (Kostuch)

DR. KOSTUCH: The last time I got to say thank you was to Mr. Bradley, and it wasn't a very pleasant thank you, but I will say a very pleasant thank you to Mr. Crerar. I know it has been a tough year for him, but I think as a result of his heart attack he has come out a better person, and in fact a better environmentalist. I can now go into his room and breathe, and I certainly appreciate being able to do that, so some good comes from all bad things.

I certainly think that I make it difficult at times for Alistair, and I certainly realize that as a result of some of my activities, and some of P.A.C.'s activities, we do create political pressure on Alistair. But as he has said, that is part of his role, and I am not about to back down just because of that political pressure. I would like to thank Alistair for coming here and speaking to us today and for giving a very good speech.

(APPLAUSE)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: This concludes this portion of our meeting, we will now adjourn back to the Max Bell Auditorium for perhaps, which I hope will be a very short meeting. We have to deal with one resolution, and one little other item, and by that time the water simulation model display should be on, perhaps we could take that in this afternoon. Thank you for coming.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON
(Resolutions)

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Welcome to Session II on the resolutions. The only major resolution we have left is one deferred resolution to consider on this session. Lub and members of his Pollution Study Group have been working hard and produced a revised version of the resolution on the impacts of pollution on health, so I will ask Lub to step forward and move his revised resolution.

DR. WOJTIW: Maybe we should give the members about five minutes to be able to read it first.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: There are copies of this resolution being passed around.

The revision opportunity on this resolution which caused its redrafting was that it was not specific enough, so Lub has made an effort to make it more specific as to what they are actually asking for. I think maybe you could step forward now, Lub.

DR. WOJTIW: Thank you very much, Bob, as you know after the comments that were made yesterday, I realized right away that this resolution had to have some further work done on it, and that's why we moved it to look at it today, and I hope it sort of meets some of the criticisms that were voiced yesterday. If not, then I would suggest, you know, if there are great changes, then I would suggest tabling the resolution and have the study group look at it in greater depth.

Anyway, I would like to move that the Resolution Number 5 which reads, "BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Lieutenant Governor in Council direct the Environment Council of Alberta to hold public hearings on the methods and procedures of dealing with environment-related human health concerns."

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Do we have a seconder for that? Bill Irwin. Any comments or concerns? If not, I will call the question, all in favor?

(SHOW OF HANDS)

Contrary?

(NONE)

(I DECLARE THE RESOLUTION CARRIED)

RESOLUTION 5 MOVED BY LUB WOJTIW, SECONDED BY BILL IRWIN.

DR. WOJTIW: Could you please remove the word "the" in front of Pincher Creek, in the second paragraph under background.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: There was one emergency resolution that was brought forward, the Coordinating Committee met immediately prior to the annual meeting to discuss this emergency resolution that was brought forward, which was on logging in the Upper Oldman River area. The Coordinating Committee considered the resolution and decided to forward this resolution directly to the appropriate Ministers through the emergency resolution procedures with one amendment. The Coordinating Committee felt that the Pollution Study Group was perhaps not the best study group to be forwarding the motion, the motion falls rather within the mandate of either Environment Protection or Renewable Resources. So the Coordinating Committee decided the most appropriate study group to sponsor the resolution was the Renewable Resources Group, and therefore the resolution was forwarded in the name of this group rather than the Pollution Study Group. I hope the Pollution Study Group will not be offended, but this was done because the Coordinating Committee felt, as Alistair mentioned, they must keep, be very careful to speak with sort of one voice and not have different related problems coming from what appears to be the wrong study group. The reason basically for selecting the Renewable Resources was that they have handled the Castle River logging problem, and therefore it was felt that our credibility would be better if they also forwarded this one.

This resolution will go forward immediately, and it will be submitted to the annual meeting next year for ratification. I have only one thing I would like to say to

complete the resolution part of that, please remember to submit your 1984 resolutions directly to the Resolutions Committee at the earliest possible date to allow review by the E.C.A. research staff, the Science Advisory Committee if necessary, to ensure that our 1984 resolutions will be as effective as possible.

I would like to thank again the members of my Committee for their support and their excellent suggestions and work throughout the year, and I'd like to thank you all for your participation, not only in these resolution sessions, but in preparing your resolutions. I think all the study groups did a very good job, and on behalf of the Resolutions Committee, I would like to thank you.

Now the last portion of this session will be devoted to the discussion on the problems of the Energy Conservation Study Group. The decision on the fate of this study group will not be made today, it is not our intention to do this. Since according to the role documents for those who have read it carefully, the creation or elimination of any study group is the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee in conjunction with E.C.A. staff, that is the senior staff. What we wish to do in this session is to solicit some of your ideas as to alternatives that the Coordinating Committee can consider to either revitalize the Energy Study Group, or alternatively, possibly to switch their mandate to another study group, or some other alternative that may be suggested in this meeting. I will ask our P.A.C. Chairman, Joe Shemanchuk to start out the discussion, and then we will ask the Chairman of the Energy Study Group, Ian Shaw, to follow Joe's remarks, and then we will open it for everyone's contributions. Joe?

MR. SHEMANCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This issue came up at our last Coordinating Committee meeting, and it was almost completed issue, but we had read the roles document, and according to the section under study groups and organizations, it says, "That the Public Advisory Committee

on environment consists of study groups whose broad terms of reference are described by the titles given below; energy conservation, environment protection, non-renewable resources, pollution, renewable resources and urban environment. The study groups may be initiated or discontinued by discussion between the Environment Council of Alberta and the Coordinating Committee." You may wonder why we brought this to this meeting, well the idea here was to expose, to provide you with this information that one study group is in trouble, and we would hope that there would be some input from the whole P.A.C. committees to see if something can be done about this. We did not come here to decide the fate of this study group, but rather to inform you of the fate that could occur, and see if there are any ideas, and we would like you to direct these through your chairman of the various respective study groups to the Coordinating Committee so that at the next Coordinating Committee some action may be taken.

This is the reason I'm bringing it up to this meeting today, and I do hope that we don't have to spend too much time on this, but I would think that perhaps the Chairman of the Energy Conservation Study Group should have a chance to say something.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Ian, would you like to take the mike for a few minutes?

MR. SHAW: Ian Shaw, Chairman of the Energy Study Group. If you have taken the opportunity to read our report, as I mentioned this morning, we have actually eight members, and of that group there is usually anywhere from three to five attending meetings. We have had some very excellent speakers and some good subjects to discuss this year, but it's not the fault of the members of the group that we are in a bad situation. When you look at the list of names of all the other groups and you see some with 40 there, or 30 and so forth, if two-thirds of them stayed away, well you would still have a big meeting. I call this to the

attention of our group at our last November 4th meeting, and asked for a consensus of opinion as to whether we could request that we be disbanded or amalgamated with another group, and I believe I am safe in saying that the opinion was that something should be done in this direction.

Now, this is not a new disease in this group, I can tell you that, and I'm saying this for the benefit of new members, there has been at least five chairmen over the years that have had the same problem, and the group never seems to exceed more than seven or eight people. Now, Bill Flook has done all he could to encourage other members among other groups to join us, and we haven't solicited any, and there is no hope apparently from any of the new members coming in that they would be interested, or that they have indicated they are interested in energy.

Another point that we have to consider is that almost every other group has at least one item on their agenda during the year, some have two or three items on their agenda through the year that are related to energy, and we feel that there is considerable conflict in this regard, and therefore it renders specialized groups such as Energy more or less obsolete. At the last meeting, some of our members came up with some ideas as to what should be done, and I will just review them with you. These are the possibilities or alternatives.

We could disband, when I say we I am assuming that you realize that it is not the members' option as Joe has already told us, we could disband at the discretion of the director and P.A.C. Coordinating Committee. Or we could integrate with another group, with the thought that if a specific energy project is brought up the members could be appointed as an ad hoc committee to consider it. We could merge with either the Renewable or Non-Renewable Resources Group, we were with the Non-Renewable Resources Group prior to 1982. The members could be left free to merge with whatever other group they chose, or we could stay as a group

and meet for just half days and only meet quarterly during the year, the 12-month period.

I was told that it would be necessary to have a motion presented in order to facilitate discussion in this matter, but perhaps that is out of order. At this moment I would like to, before we go any further, I neglected to do it this morning, thank the staff of the E.C.A., Bill Flook, Alistair Crerar, Randy, and the other ladies, Ken Nelson for their excellent help. If we hadn't had their encouragement and help, we couldn't have continued this year.

I think that is about all I want to say at the moment, if anybody wishes to comment I'll be glad to answer. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Does anyone have any questions for Ian? Martha?

DR. KOSTUCH: I don't really have any questions for Ian, I know that Joe said we should leave this for discussion in the study group, but I think it is important to discuss it here with all the members present at least to some degree. I see the Energy Study Group as being a very valuable study group and a very important issue, and I don't wish to see it disbanded. I think issues like the nuclear issue need to be worked on, need to be worked on not by study groups who already have lots on their plates, but by a study group that can donate some time to that issue and develop a policy on nuclear energy. We certainly need more work on the soft energy pact and more work on conservation. I see energy as a solution, in fact, to many of the problems that we're facing in the other study groups, because if we do look at things like soft energy pacts, the need for the Slave River Dam is reduced. The need for coal generating plants which cause air pollution is decreased. I would like to put forth some other alternatives other than those that Ian has already offered, and that would be, I know we tried this a number of years ago, but perhaps we should try it again, we need an active campaign among the existing P.A.C. members and study groups to solicit membership for the Energy Study

Group. And another alternative would be that we go out and solicit non-P.A.C. members, people that we can identify who are interested in the energy issues. There are many in this province who are doing a lot on the energy issues that are not necessarily currently members of P.A.C. Bob Cameron from up north near the Grande Prairie area, Bill Ross from Calgary are both doing a considerable amount of work, and if we can't find members within P.A.C. who wish to join the group, then I think we should solicit members from outside of P.A.C. because I think it is very valuable.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you for your comments, Martha. Ian?

MR. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to that, I guess I didn't emphasize particularly its lack of membership that is our problem; membership, people, membership; it is not programs, we had Bill Ross as a guest speaker, if you will read my report you will see we had some of the most outstanding speakers in Alberta address us, and we had some very interesting subjects. But it is very embarrassing to ask, well for example, a man like Dr. Ross to come and address three or four people at a meeting, and it is very depressing to have three or four people stay to conduct the business session afterwards. As one of our members aptly put it, he said that the people of Alberta are so wealthy and that they believe they have absolutely unlimited resources in energy that will always be cheap energy, there is nobody that really has an interest in the energy program. Now I realize what Martha said is correct, there are many, many people in Alberta who are not only interested in energy, but they are doing something about it, Dr. Canfield for example, Abex Industries in Calgary, and there is lots of other companies, there is companies that are developing exchangers like electric exchangers in the province, but these are people who are working in their own businesses, and I doubt very much whether they would be interested, I doubt whether we could ask them to be members

of P.A.C.; could we, Bill?

MR. FLOOK: As unaffiliated members, yes.

MR. SHAW: Well there is those type of people, but it is a question of whether we can get the membership, and there certainly isn't any interest among the present members.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: I think it is still a good suggestion of Martha's that we try and keep it going, and that is I believe the feeling of the Coordinating Committee that we should try and keep it going if it is at all possible. Bill, would you like to make a comment?

MR. FLOOK: Yes, I would like to make one comment, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the best possibility for enhancing the membership of the Energy Study Group lies in persuading other members of P.A.C. to transfer their allegiance to it from other study groups. The division of the membership is quite unbalanced at the moment, some of them are very, very unwieldy, heavy, in fact, in some cases I think I would get agreement from some of the members of those groups that the attendance that is attending their meetings now tends to stress the facilities we have in meeting rooms to its capacity. So that it would be desirable from every point of view to have some amount of redistribution of members, and if this can be done to the benefit of the Energy Study Group, that would be a great plus.

One thing that I think mitigates against it, is although we have tried to banish this idea, people tend to think that once they have given their allegiance to one study group that it is a permanent allegiance, and that it is a very difficult thing, or that they would be imposing on us, the staff of E.C.A. unreasonable chores to have them transferred to another group. That is not so, it is the easiest thing in the world to transfer somebody from one group to another, and in fact, I think it might be a very good thing to have happen, and happen in continuity, a bit of movement around between the study groups. And if you could pass a message

on to the individual Chairmen of study groups that not only do we desperately need some amount of redistribution in the membership now to save the energy study group and do what they can to induce this to happen, but to encourage this as a continuing thing. I think it would be a very good thing.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you, Bill. Joe, did you want to make a comment?

MR. SHEMANCHUK: Before any more comments are made, I hope I did not leave the impression that I didn't want to discuss the issue here at this meeting. What I really didn't want was any decisions made at this meeting. What I want is any ideas to be put forth to the Coordinating Committee so that we could deal with it at the next meeting of the Coordinating Committee.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Okay, Joe. Joanne Hedenstrom.

MS. HEDENSTROM: It sounds like I should save my comments for the Coordinating Committee, but I really think that with the jobs decreasing in Alberta and energy prices increasing, this committee may well be a coming thing. I would certainly like to see it kept, and I would agree with Martha that I can think of some people that would be very interested in this committee. I am not sure that nobody exists, and I would like the chance, and I guess it has to be with the Coordinating Committee, to suggest possible membership, I think this might be an interesting way to go. I see you have already invited someone from Solar Energy Society, I assume that person would go. I certainly see it as a viable committee.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you, Joanne. Horst?

MR. FAUSER: Yes, I would like to speak to the suggestion of transferring from other committees, and I was torn there very much since I do have some interest, quite a bit in energy, but also our Non-Renewable Resource Committee comes up with topics that are dear to me, and it's not that I don't want to leave them because they are not interesting, no, I want to stay with them because of the topics. But on

the other hand, energy also has, pricing is one of my pets, and I brought it up in our committee and we discussed it, and I made a presentation. I suggested to Bill maybe if I could on occasion join the Energy Study Group, but apparently due to cost related factors that is not possible. Maybe if the committee could look into the suggestion I made that a member who would like to stay in his committee but on occasions would visit with the other committee members for his special topics, if that could be possible.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you for your suggestions. Jean?

MRS SLOAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, as the Acting Chairman of the Urban Environment Study Group, I think that the thought of the Energy Committee completely dissolving it seems unreal at this time. And our Urban Environment Group touches on their area so closely, and I would like the Coordinating Committee to seriously consider merging their group with our group if they are so inclined.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you, Jean. Ian?

MR. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, one final word, our next meeting is scheduled for the first Friday in February, I believe it is the 3rd if I am correct, at 9:30 in the morning in the Weber Centre, and we will see how many people show up.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thanks, Dr. Buckmaster?

DR. BUCKMASTER: Harvey Buckmaster from S.A.C. I think that the problem that is involved here is probably one that is the nature of the energy conservation concept, and that is that I think as I noted one of my colleagues, Bill Ross, has talked to the group about a particular energy scenario; I think that you're going to go that the nature of the educational experience and energy conservation involves getting people involved and actually doing some scenarios for themselves and then discussing those. I would throw out the challenge that I would like to see the potential of the Energy Conservation Group coming to annual meetings with a proposed energy scenario for Alberta that

would be the object of a resolution. I think that's a possibility that we should not forget about just because Friends of the Earth did their study doesn't mean to say we should agree with it, and in that context I think there is another component and maybe it's a role that this committee could play, and that is that there are an ongoing series of books written on energy issues now and one of my favorite pastimes is to act as book reviewer for a number of technical journals on such books, and I find that a fascinating excuse to read books that I might otherwise never read. I think that a group like the Energy Conservation Group should be compiling bibliographies and distributing them to other groups to encourage people to see material which is related to their study group.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thank you for your comments, Dr. Buckmaster. Cam?

MR. FINLAY: Cam Finlay from the Urban Group, I support your suggestion, but all these people who are in favor of not disbanding the Energy Group, I would expect them to be at the next Energy Group meeting, and if they are not there, an I say this seriously because this is not the first time we have heard this discussion, and I have been on the outside looking on, I think that there is something wrong here, people are not really coming to grips. The gentleman over there said it very well. He said that he would love to be on the Energy Group but he can't belong to two groups. And I ask all of you who spoke in favor of it, are you going to be there on February 3rd?

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Thanks Cam, well I think that as Joe mentioned before, one of our main objectives is to ask all the study group Chairmen to put this on the agenda of their next meeting and discuss it, and see if we -- we don't want to rob the other study groups just to give Energy more, but if anyone is on another study group and interested in energy then I think that it might be a great idea if they transferred. I think this is what we want to discuss, I think maybe Joe

might like the final word, do you, Joe?

MR. SHEMANCHUK: Just to finish the meeting, yes I do.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Okay, I would just like to make one comment if I could first, I would like to thank you all for your suggestions and ideas as to what course the Coordinating Committee might adopt. I can assure you they will consider them all, and because it is a heart-wrenching decision to reach, and that is why we brought it here to see how the membership felt about it, not to make a decision, as Joe mentioned.

I would like to thank one person that I haven't heard anybody else thank yet, but who, throughout the course of this meeting has probably worked harder than anyone else, and that is I would like to thank the Court Reporter, Loretta Mott, for giving up her weekend to record the Minutes for our annual meeting.

(APPLAUSE)

DR. WOJTIW: Can I make an announcement?

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: Yes, go ahead.

DR. WOJTIW: In your brochures there was a set of questions with regard to the next annual meeting. Can the members fill this out and give it to Randy Pretty at your convenience, or send it in with their expense accounts? We would like to get the responses of those things as early as possible. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARDSON: I would also like to thank Louise Horstman for the excellent job she did in organizing this meeting, and now I will turn it back to Joe for final words to close off the formal session.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Thank you, Bob. Well, all the thank you's have been made that I have on my list, but I wish to just reiterate and express my personal agreement in all of this. Also, I am going to remind you about these sheets, it is very important that we have those because that gives us ideas to the next Vice-Chairman for what it is going to be about and where it will be held.

So I personally thank you all for coming to this meeting, I also thank you personally to all the people that worked so hard to make this meeting the success that it was. So with this, I will close this portion of the meeting, and tonight there is going to be the banquet, and you all know that the happy half hour is on at 6:30. We hope that you will be able to meet with the Minister, but before we close, Ken Nelson does have some instructions as to how we collect our expenses.

This closes this portion of our meeting, we will see you all here tonight.

(MEETING ADJOURNED)

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: I would like to call Alistair to introduce our guest speaker.

MR. CRERAR: I sort of think of myself to come in here and sort of calm the waters and get enough quiet so the Minister will be heard tonight. Last year was my first opportunity to introduce the Minister to this gathering, and at that time, I spoke of his youth, his political savvy and experience, and of course the fact that he'd only been in office for one month. This time, you have before you a battle-scarred veteran. He doesn't really look all that much scarred, but he really is, they are all internal, I think.

You know, in theory with the slowdown that we have had in industrial activity, there should be fewer pressures on the environment, and in fact it should be a time when environmental standards could be improved or enhanced. However, at the same time it is a period of constraint, where there is less money, less manpower to do all those things we ask government to do. In addition there is a commonly held belief that environmental rules and regulations are just some more of that -- and here you add whatever swear word you favor of your choice -- red tape. That is commonly held belief that environmental rules and regulations are just some more of that blank red tape that is strangling entrepreneurs. And I think I mentioned that I thought that was a bum rap.

We certainly wouldn't want to defend all environmental rules and regulations. I'm sure some are silly, and some are inappropriate, and they should be changed. Others, however, are critical. If the environmental regulations, for example, were to prevent the location of a Kraft pulp mill at Rocky Mountain House, I am playing to my audience here, all Alberta, particularly one-third of Albertans located downstream from Rocky would benefit. It is the ability to distinguish the useful from the petty, the good from the bad, that is the principal task of the Minister of the Environment.

So this will be a report from the trenches from the Minister of the Environment, but not from a young rookie, but from a veteran of this last year. He has had enough time to identify what the condition of the battlefield is like, to mount some campaigns, a few sorties, though not enough to see them completed, and any kind of result of the continuing fight or the continuing battle. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to present the Minister of the Environment, the Honourable Fred Bradley.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Ladies and Gentlemen, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to be with you this evening. I think Alistair has mentioned a few things that I was going to comment on in my speech too, so there may be some duplication.

Last year when I was here, I was three weeks or a month into the portfolio, we were at Medicine Hat, and I was in the midst of, say, what should one describe the experience of just stepping into that portfolio in terms of the Lodgepole blowout and having to handle that, I guess trial by fire, I'm not sure how one should describe that. Three weeks into the portfolio and the Lodgepole blowout was certainly the major item that I had to spend a lot of time on, and we really didn't get our office operational as one would like to in terms of assuming a portfolio. We did not have time to do a number of the, sort of, move into the office and have an opportunity to plan what we were doing, we were right in the middle of a lot of media attention, et cetera, on the Lodgepole blowout and it was an interesting time.

Here we are one year later, and Lodgepole is still in the newspapers with the hearings that are taking place by the ERCB. But it has been a very interesting year for me.

Last year, when I was brand new to the portfolio, and brand new to the responsibility, I knew it was going

to be a challenging experience, and it has been. I knew it was going to be a learning experience. And now, one year later, it is still a challenge, and I have found out that it is still a very interesting experience, and I'm sure it is going to continue to be one throughout my term as Minister.

I guess as an after dinner speaker, one should be able to provide you with some levity and some entertainment, and I was thinking about what sort of a joke I might be able to tell this evening. I guess I am not going to be able to provide you with that type of levity. I think the environment is very serious business. There are not very many jokes you can tell about the environment. I guess you can talk about the weather, I often take credit for nice beautiful warm summer days, and any of the bad weather that we have, I always point to the fellow up there, and let him assume responsibility for that.

Tonight I want to talk in two areas, and I'm not going to speak at length this evening. I thought perhaps a question period or bear-pit session would be where we could really have a good dialogue, and maybe that would be the entertainment too. I'm not sure about that.

But I wanted to talk in two areas, one is what Alistair had alluded to, the terms of the provincial economy and where we are at financially and the sort of times that we are in. Generally, in terms of the province's economy, I would have to say generally it's healthy; we have got two basic industries; agriculture and the petroleum industry and they are, although they have their ups and downs, generally two very strong bases for our economy. Resource development is important to the province, we know that. We, in terms of the provincial finances, we are in a period of deficit financing, and we are in a period of time where in 1982/'83 we had a $2.4 billion deficit. This year a deficit around a billion dollars, and when we look at where our provincial revenues come from, we find that taxes, corporate taxes, personal income taxes, other revenue sources the provinces have in terms of taxation, equals the total amount of what we spent in the health care area, which means that the rest of the provincial budget is funded basically from our resource revenue base. So it is very important to the province.

I might note that in terms of each government department and area when we are in a period of deficit financing, we are certainly looking at all our areas of expenditures, and each government department's programs are being reviewed by the Ministers involved to see where we can become more effective, and looking at areas where a program expenditure which may in our opinion after looking at them are perhaps redundant or no longer necessary. There are a lot of programs that we have got into in a period when there was a boom in the province and there was a demand. We have to review that in terms of the financial position we are in today.

So, I don't believe in the next few years, given the financial position and the fiscal position of the province, there are going to be funds for a lot of new programs, and we are certainly going to be reviewing the necessity of a number of areas of our expenditures.

To get back to resource development, it is important to the province, and it has to be done in an environmentally responsible manner. Now, I think one of the chief challenges that a portfolio like mine and interested citizens, concerned citizens as yourselves have got to face in terms of resource development and environmental concerns in the '80's, is going to be, in terms of environmental concerns, to be able to sell them on the basis of the economic arguments that it makes sense to do certain things in terms of resource development, or in terms of things we are involved in society on the basis of the longer term economic savings that can be made by

implementing these type of environmental regulations or controls. I think it is well accepted that we have to have environmental regulations to cover the basic health related questions or concerns and the basic safety concerns. But I think we're going to be faced with the challenge to point out the economic benefits of certain types of environmental regulations. That is going to be the challenge in terms of bringing forward environmental concerns.

So that the necessity to sell these environmental concerns in an economic direction, I think that a lot of the aesthetic types of concerns which we have had which are not related to basic health and safety, or the intangibles, it could be difficult to sell that type of environmental regulation. But sound environmental concerns could be sold on the basis of their net benefit from an economic point of view that doing these things will save us dollars tomorrow in terms of clean-up et cetera, that is where the focus is going to have to be. I believe that is one of the major challenges that I face in my Ministry in terms of taking forward these arguments with regards to environmental concerns to my Cabinet colleagues. I would suggest to you too, that when you are coming forward to me if you could bring forward arguments on that basis, I would be pleased to hear them.

The second area that I want to cover tonight is a question that has concerned me, and has perhaps become very apparent to me in terms of portfolio responsibility, something which I entitle "Scientific Literacy". We are in a very technological world, we have equipment, measuring equipment like the Trace Atmospheric Gas Analyzer, the TAGA Unit, which can pretty well tell you to almost the minutest degree what is anywhere around us. And so we can pretty well find anywhere, any substance, and we really haven't had to deal with those types of things in terms of how we look at our environment. These things, probably a lot of these substances have been around for a long time, we just haven't been able to measure them. It is very difficult to decide when you find very small amounts of an element, a metal or a substance which in terms of newspaper headlines, or in terms of general public knowledge, that specific substance is linked to certain types of disease, or has been known to cause a certain type of disease. It is very important that we are able to define exactly what level of substances will have what sort of effect on our citizens.

We have around us a number of toxic substances which we take for granted in our everyday way of life. For example, water in enough volume can be toxic to human life. Oxygen, too much oxygen will also kill people. So we have to be very clear in terms of the levels of substances when we are talking in the world we are in today in terms of discussing these things with the public. We require to have an informed public, but the challenge is going to be on governments, the media, the academic community and environmental organizations to make sure when we are communicating with the public, that we come forward with facts and information which the public can understand; and which is not going to be alarmist in terms of their effect upon people.

I notice, and I won't make any direct references to certain media reports, but there have been some that have come forward over the last year, which by their nature have been very alarmist in terms of the effect on people where the whole story has not been told, or a piece of information has been put out there without explaining exactly what that information means.

One of the other things that has to do with the whole question of scientific literacy, and again is some of the theories and hypothesis that we deal with in terms of the environmental risk, et cetera. The linear extrapolation hypothesis where they tell you, and this is

a theory which is used a great deal in terms of looking at that risk, for example if one person smoked 2 million cigarettes it would have a certain effect, and I think we know what that effect would be. But this linear extrapolation hypothesis also comes back that if 2 million people each smoke one cigarette, you would have the same effect. I don't think you will necessarily want to buy that story.

One scientist, based on that background, came up with the theory that if a person had one or two cups of coffee every day of their life, it would increase the probability of that person having cancer 2.6 fold. I'm not sure if that is useful in terms of discussion with our citizens.

Another fact that has come to my attention in terms of the Three Mile Island incident, in terms of the radiation concerns which were expressed there, and probably very legitimate. But one fact that came forward to my attention is that the amount of radiation which people in the Three Mile Island area were exposed to would be equivalent to what any one of us would be exposed to if we flew in an aircraft from New York City to Edmonton. But in terms of what was taking place during the Three Mile Island incident, I don't think those type of radiation exposures were really communicated to the public. We really have a job to do.

I think each of us accepts, again in terms of our everyday lives, one person in a community of 4,000 will probably be killed in an automobile accident in a year, and that's the sort of risk which we are aware of. But in terms of industrial pollution, or the effect of industrial pollution, and I have to admit that we all voluntarily get into our automobile, and we accept that one in 4,000 risk when we get into our automobile. But we are not prepared as society to perhaps accept the risk that one person in 2 million population exposed to industrial emissions may succumb to that in a one year period. So these are some of the challenges that we face.

I guess I would like to conclude my remarks with the fact that we have got to look at this question of scientific literacy, and when we are talking to the public, we have to make sure that they are well informed and we are not coming forward with information which is based on extremely low levels of exposure, and extrapolating that it would have a certain effect unless we are absolutely clearly sure about that. I am looking forward to the question period. I have been at a couple of, let us say municipal conventions this year, and a meeting of the Health Unit Association, where usually we have four or five Ministers are available, and we call them a bear-pit session. I was at the Urban Municipalities Meeting, and I only got one question; I thought perhaps the department must have been doing an excellent job over the years in terms of the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, for I was only asked one question in this hour and a half bear-pit session. But I don't have my colleagues here this evening to have that certain comfort level, I guess, so really I am looking forward to the questions and perhaps I think it is an opportunity for us to dialogue, and I'm sure there are a number of questions which you have for me this evening, and I will attempt to answer them the best I can. But also it will give me an opportunity to find out what you are thinking, what your thoughts are, what your concerns are. I think that is important to me in terms of my portfolio. Also, as I said to you last year, if you do have a concern, perhaps you would also provide me with what your thoughts or ideas are to resolve that concern.

So with that, I would open it up for questions.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Are there any questions from the crowd Before we start the questions, we have no microphones, so anybody who has questions, please holler so that the Minister can hear the questions so he could answer. So we will now entertain the first question. Ron Whistance-Smith. Perhaps

you could identify yourself by name and study group for the record.

MR. WHISTANCE-SMITH: Ron Whistance-Smith, Renewable Resources Study Group. Sir, I think first of all in your comparison between the person who has 1 in 4,000 automobile accidents and the person who may be 1 in 2 million or whatever that dies from the industrial emission is a faulty thing, because in one case you're dealing with the maximum, in the other you are not dealing with the maximum. But that is not really my question.

What I wanted to ask you is you have put a great deal of emphasis, and the government has placed a great deal of emphasis on the cost of health care in the province; have you tried to evaluate what the cost of, if you like, pollution in the atmosphere and the pollution of the water and so on is in relation to that total health care cost? How many people who are utilizing health care are utilizing it because of poor water quality or poor air quality?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: No, we haven't done that specific type of analysis, and I should like to comment, I should have added in terms of my remarks, I don't think that we should accept the 1 in 2 million risk, I don't think I am prepared to accept that, because it is an involuntary exposure that you are looking at. But I thought it useful to look at the comparison in terms of what the risk and probabilities are.

With regards about water quality and air quality, I think if you are looking at air quality, probably your automobile emissions in your major urban areas are probably a greater concern in terms of exposure to citizens. Water quality, I think generally in terms of the tests of the water supply in the province there are not too many situations where the quality of water would be a risk to health. I am not aware, in terms of our monitoring and licensing et cetera, in terms of guidelines, most of our water supply either meets those guidelines or they are pursuing options to improve their supply. I might add that over the last four years, since 1979, the province by itself has put forward some 400 millions of dollars to municipalities to assist them with treatment of water and the treatment of their domestic sewage effluent.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Are there any other questions? Charlie, and then Martha.

DR. WOOD: Charlie Wood, Renewable Resources. Mr. Minister, perhaps we are putting you at a bit of a disadvantage, sometimes we have had transportation problems, and perhaps you have not been able to read the Calgary Herald tonight.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I have not read it.

DR. WOOD: There is an individual Merv Anderson who I understand is not particularly a fan of yours, so we have to assume that there is a bias.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I met the gentleman, but never had any, as I can recollect, I met this gentleman three or four years ago, and I have not met him since, so I'm not sure of that.

DR. WOOD: He is talking about this business of grants for sewage treatment and this sort of thing, and his statement is, "As for capital grants the Minister said, 'For your information the Cities of Calgary and Edmonton have not received funding under the grant program because of the relatively low accumulated per capita cost of sewage treatment constructed since the advent of the program in 1978'", and he makes a number of derogatory remarks about this, and he says that the "formula was rigged to give generous aid to rural centres while excluding Calgary and Edmonton." I'm sorry, if you haven't had a chance to read this, you are at a disadvantage, but perhaps you could comment on this.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, the program, as you know,

has been transferred now to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications, so in terms of my direct responsibility, you know, I'm not responsible for the granting of funds at this point in time. But I think it is fair to say that we have asked that in terms of the way the program was set up and his comparison may be accurate, I know that in each community we have got up to about, I am trying to remember the figure, $300 per capita we were asking the communities to bring forward first before our grant program came in, and then the provincial government contributed, I believe 90 percent of the rest up to $2,100 per capita. So certainly some of these facilities are expensive, but I don't think if other municipalities are required to spend X number of dollars per capita before the formula kicks in, it would be fair if Edmonton and Calgary were not treated in the same manner as the other population areas in the province.

Even at that, we have assisted the City of Calgary with the phosphorous removal program, and contributed half the cost of that phosphorous removal program to the City in terms of both their sewage treatment plants. I think there was some $18 million contributed to the City of Calgary to that program, it was recognized there was a need there and the province should assist them, so we have a system there. In the Edmonton region at this point in time, construction of a $150 million regional sewage system is underway at this time with a major treatment facility and a number of trunklines, and the City of Edmonton expressed some interest in utilizing some of the capacity of that system.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Martha?

DR. KOSTUCH: You said something about the TAGA Unit being able to determine what the effects of low level chemical emissions are; is the government or the Department of the Environment going to spend some time and effort in determining what the effects of those low level chemicals are?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I think it would be beyond the ability of our department or our government alone to look at these things. There is a lot of expertise in the scientific community throughout the world, and each are addressing different areas. But it is certainly an area where we have to look at, and in terms of our own priorities, our department is funding in our Environmental Centre an Inhalation Toxicology program specifically looking at H_2S and SO_2.

DR. KOSTUCH: That doesn't put any emphasis on the low levels.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: It will look at that specific question.

DR. KOSTUCH: On the one in 2 million figure, speaking of scientific literacy, where does that 1 in 2 million figure come from, and one further question; on the Pincher Creek issue, as both Minister of the Environment and MLA for that area, what are you doing to answer the health questions in that area? What studies do you plan to find out what is causing the health problems in that area, and I do not expect you to turn the question over to Webber, because I realize there is three Ministers working together on this.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: In terms of where the figure 1 in 2 million came from, that was a figure that was provided to me, and I don't have the specific source. But --

DR. KOSTUCH: Is there any scientific basis for that source?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: In terms of, I believe it is specific industrial exposure, I would have to --

DR. KOSTUCH: I would appreciate your information.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I will get that to you, I will track down the source of that.

Now, the other with regard to the Pincher Creek situation, there are currently two departments who are specifically looking at that area. The thing is beyond the

mandate of my particular department specifically. The Energy Resources Conservation Board has had input into it, as has Dr. Webber's department, they are reviewing that information. My involvement in that both as a Member of the Legislature for that area and as Minister of Environment, I guess my advice and involvement is on a consulting basis in terms of coming forward on that specific issue. But the prime responsibility is not in terms of the Department of the Environment.

DR. KOSTUCH: What advice are you giving them?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, we are looking at a number of options, and I am not, quite frankly, able to be in a position this evening to go much beyond that except that the issue is being addressed and looked at.

DR. KOSTUCH: When will you be in a position to go beyond that?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, the Minister responsible if and when we come to any conclusion on the matter will be making an announcement. It would be his responsibility to make that announcement.

DR. HACKLER: Jim Hackler, from the Science Advisory Committee. One of the functions of every government, of course, is to deal with the critics in society, and one strategy that worked reasonably well over the years is to group the trouble-makers into an advisory committee, and then if you get these advisory committees in a mellow mood and bring them to a nice setting and give them wine and what have you, they become even mellower and sometimes --

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Not this group.

DR. HACKLER: At least they are more reasonable, put it that way. There is a danger, of course, that this very important critical role may be dampened somewhat, and I'm wondering whether one could bring the balance back in by being sure that a certain amount of information gets to the group which normally you would not put in the hands of troublemakers. For example, some of the real dilemmas that politicians have to face, there is some real pressures on them that you don't really want to tell anybody about. But as the group gets more reasonable, perhaps one could have a trade-off in that look here, the real dilemmas that we are facing, and I can't tell you exactly what they are, but I can leak the information to my civil servants who can speak more openly; do you think there is a possibility that you might get a more productive and societal usefulness out of a group like this if there was a greater variety of information coming from middle ranges and lower levels of your civil servants about some of the real dilemmas that we are facing, in order that the recommendations that this group makes do take into account some of these realities? Otherwise, you find that you either mellow people out or you get a confrontational tactic, I'm just wondering if there is a better role here, a better way to handle it?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: That's appropriate for you to raise that, and I think that a number of issues that come forward, just as I was commenting on in my remarks, if information is not presented properly to the public, it could be misinterpreted, and you could really get an "alarmist type scare" going out there just because of the nature of some of the information you deal with. If one was able to have that type of discussion and be assured that once you are able to have a discussion in confidence and until you have come to some conclusion on them, I think there is opportunity to do that. But let's take the recent Pincher Creek/Gulf Reclamation Study, with that specific incident which required time in terms of looking at what the information was and analyzing and having a chance to look at it, I appointed a task force to review the situation there. But Gulf was doing the reclamation study, they came to me two weeks before they intended to make it public and told me basically that they had done this, that it hadn't yet been concluded and it would be concluded shortly and there was some information there which they provided to

me verbally, no hard facts, and they said that they wanted to meet with the people down in Pincher Creek to let them know exactly what they had found. I said, yes, I agree with you, you shouldn't do that until you are in a position to. The study itself wasn't really in any finalized form for about another 10 days, and I received a copy of the study, or the department received it on a Friday morning, which was three days before the meeting on Monday in which Gulf was going to deliver this information to the people in the Pincher Creek area. And an Edmonton Journal reporter, I don't know by what means, found out about the report and some of the contents, and without having the full report, made some statements which made headlines in the Edmonton Journal newspaper. And it is really difficult to deal with these type of issues if the information somehow is not conveyed to the public in an appropriate form.

Now, I was accused in that instance of holding back the report, which I didn't have, which wasn't even in my hands when the headline was in the newspaper. But I think if we could develop a process, and I'm looking at reviewing our consultation process, our public consultation process, that it would be very useful to be able to discuss some of these issues in a form that one could, there could be mutual respect in terms of confidentiality and the nature of the discussions. It would be useful to have that type of exchange. I'm not sure the way the Public Advisory Committee has operated to this date would necessarily be conducive to that, because as I understand, all your study group meetings are open meetings. Sometimes you just can't sit down in that sort of a forum, if the media is going to be attending these type of meetings, to discuss these type of things. But it is something that I certainly am looking at to see if there is a mechanism whereby that type of consultation can take place.

MR. PASCHEN: Gerry Paschen, Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. The question dealing with Lodgepole, any firm in Edmonton that is large enough and wants to do a project has to take on a permit, and then of course, the permit is taken out, there is a certain amount of inspection before the project is approved. I think when we come to Lodgepole we have this same kind of a problem here, I think those contractors who do a job should take out a permit, which they do, but what is lacking at the moment is a certain amount of inspection. And I think when we look at proportion when I am driving on a highway, speedin too fast, or whether I do unnecessary things, there is always somebody there watching, and I call those people by-law enforcement officers. I would like to know whether there will be provisions made in the future to have these kinds of new people going around and double checking other people's work to make sure that it is right so that we do not have another duplication of Lodgepole. So I would like to know from you whether it is possible to have a new battery of individuals calling themselves inspectors and going around and checking up on those sites to make sure that there is a blowout valve installed and not reversed, and if there is sufficient casing installed to prevent those sort of things before we have a problem?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: My response would be those mechanisms are in place and the Lodgepole enquiry itself whic the ERCB is conducting is reviewing those matters. If they come up with some conclusions that they are going to be required, you know, to change their procedures, then the Energy and Resources Conservation Board, who has the responsibility for looking at particularly oilwell drilling activities, they are responsible, so if there are improvements to their system, I am sure they will come forward with recommendations in that area. There is not going to be, in terms of the provincial budget in the next fiscal year, funds available for new programs and hiring new people. We're going to have to do with the manpower we have, and perhaps reduce manpower in terms of the things that we do

As a department, we do have a monitoring program in terms of industrial plants, and we generally get, I think, some pretty good information from what the different industrial emission sources are, from the different industrial emission sources in the province, and I think that program generally is working.

MR. PASCHEN: Basically what I really wanted to say, and maybe I did get the point across but not to the refined degree, and that is legislation is a very costly process to achieve, and so are various rules and amendments to the ERCB. What I would also like to point out is that in spite of those laws being in place, it is essential that they are being checked up on, you know, and so I think that even though legislation isn't just done by itself, it's done by the taxpayer, and so the whole purpose is to protect that taxpayer. So really all I'm asking is that just whatever law is put in place through the form of legislation, let it be checked up on, or else the whole system isn't worth it when we make policies and rules and regulations, we might as well, and I put it very straightforward, go home and forget all about it. So I think, we are, we matter, I think that is important.

I also want to point out too, that if our government wants to continue, then naturally they have to serve the people or they may not get re-elected.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I'm well aware of that. You make a good point, but there are, within the management systems of each government agency, there are those specific types of audits taking place.

MR. SMITH: Alan Smith, Urban Pollution Study Group. You have mentioned automobile pollution and industrial pollution, I ran some tests in St. Albert and I found that most of the sulphur dioxide was coming from fireplaces, people burning coke, 60 percent. I tested the organic emissions, 90 percent of them were of fireplace origin. I tested the particulates, 80 percent were of fireplace origin. We haven't heard very much about fireplace pollution, and yet you are aware that stoves and fireplaces being installed in Alberta are models that had been banned from Sweden through the Tropics to New Zealand, so there is no surprise that they are the major source of pollution, at least in St. Albert, and I would say that is typical of most areas in Alberta. Would you comment about that?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I think we have come a long way in terms home heating emissions. Certainly it's a subject that one should take another look at. If there is an increased proliferation of people going back to wood burning and coal sources, but generally in the province most homes are heated by natural gas and there is not a real crisis situation, I would say. There probably are specific incidents which may cause some problems, but overall I don't think that's a major issue.

MR. SMITH: As I say, they are the major source of pollution, far exceeding all other sources. Your department does not do the standard tests on air quality other countries do. If they did, they would have found this already.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I'm not sure that I would necessarily agree with that.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: You have a question, Charlie Wood?

DR. WOOD: I don't think we can say we are at a disadvantage from not having read this one in the paper, but in the Herald for a couple of days it said that you were going to make an announcement on the hazardous waste disposal thing, in the New Year or whatever, so could you make a comment on that?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, I hope to be in a position to make that announcement probably in the New Year. There is an outside chance it will be a Christmas present, but I'm not sure if I'm going to have the ability to make a Christmas announcement. It is certainly a high priority of mine, the whole question of siting of a special waste

facility and moving forward to implement the plant itself in terms of handling those types of waste in the province.

I think this is an area that this group has identified and we have been working on it for four years, you know, it is a difficult one. We are almost getting to the same type of situation trying to locate any sort of sanitary landfill also, it is difficult. It is not an easy decision to be able to implement.

DR. WOOD: I realize that.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I think the key note of our process has been public acceptability, I think we could probably very easily pick the best site in terms of technology and everything else, but it has to be publicly accepted too, and that is one of the areas that we are spending a lot of time on at this point in time to make sure that where we do site the plant it meets our technological requirements and our hydrogeological requirements et ceters. So we should have that degree of public acceptance. I'm not sure when we locate one of these things that everybody will be 100 percent behind it, it would sure be nice if one was able to do that.

DR. WOOD: There is the acceptability to potential users too.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Yes, users, there is that requirement, but I think the people who live around, who have to live with this sort of a development have got to be satisfied, and I think that is pretty important.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Ridley?

DR. SHAW: Ridley Shaw, Pollution Study Group. I am willing to concede, Mr. Minister, you have a distinct advantage over me at this moment, because I have had at least one drink before this occasion, and I'm quite certain that you have not. But I could not allow your statement with respect to the instrumentation of the 20th century as providing difficulties in your department interpreting situations where you should have some concern and how you should cope with them. What I am specifically referring to is that the business of very low concentration of compounds within the air and within the water that are of concern to biologists who work with animals. And it seems to me that I have the feeling from Environment Alberta that they feel this kind of information has no bearing on the health of human beings. I would like to ask you a short question to begin with, and then I would like to make another comment. The question is, that in the light of the dilemma that we have at the present time in our modern society, that although we have a great deal of information with respect to animal life, we do not know what the response of humans are to very low levels of compounds, many others than just H_2S; has Environment Alberta given any consideration to financing within our two universities, long term studies with respect to the effects of many of these compounds on humans? Now, I make this emphasis on effects on humans, because the courts of the land will not accept animal data when you try to prove that a human insult has been suffered. So it would seem to me a logical consequence of this kind of discussion is that you people with the one or two dollars that you have gained through the petroleum industry within this country should apply some of that money to, as I say, financing within medical faculties of universities long term studies of environment areas to low level concentrations of those kinds of compounds that we know arise from the industries that we have in this province, and I am of course referring to the petrochemical industry, but there are others as well. Would you care to comment on that first, please, sir?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, the department doesn't directly deal with those questions of human health impacts, that is the responsibility really of the Department of Social Services and Community Health. But to just elaborate on that, certainly that should be a concern of the medical community itself in terms of impact of different substances,

and I can't see why what you are suggesting is not within the scope of possibility for the Alberta Heritage Medical Research Foundation to look at. We have provided a Heritage Medical Research Foundation with some $300 million, and the type of research which you are suggesting I think is definitely, in my mind, maybe appropriate for that foundation to look at.

DR. SHAW: Well, you can see the dilemma, and I don't want to belabour it --

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: The other comment I make, and it is not only a problem which Alberta faces, it is a problem which all industrial societies face, not only here but throughout Canada, North America and the Western industrialized States, and the type of research you are suggesting has to be co-ordinated, perhaps, on an international basis to be sure that there isn't duplication and that the appropriate steps are being taken. I think it is beyond the resources of a single province to look at the questions which you raise.

DR. SHAW: I fully --

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: There are probably appropriate areas that this province could be involved in, and there is a mechanism there I think that could focus in on the type of concerns that you raise.

DR. SHAW: Mr. Minister, I would like to point out one situation to you, and I'm sure you are well aware of the dilemma we are up against here. Environment Alberta are people who do the monitoring of compounds which may or may not be of health concern within our various portions of the environment, however, how do you get the correlation between the activities of Environment Alberta with Community Health and Social Services who have the human health considerations? Have you ever considered that you should have an involvement in the medical aspects of it, because you are the people who collect the primary information as to whether or not you should or should not be concerned on the human health problem?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, the department provides that expertise to other government departments, and specifically sits on the Board of Health where these types of issues or concerns come forward.

DR. SHAW: Just one other point then.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Just one more.

DR. SHAW: This is the last one, Joe, I promise, and I would just like to point that out to the Minister, because I do not expect you to answer this, sir, you won't be able to. You must appreciate that when you're given information that says if we only have one individual within a whole community that is suffering from a particular insult from the environment, that is too bad. Now, I may be exaggerating slightly, but this is the way I hear your message.. In other words, we have certain individuals within our population, who, because of their genetic background, are going to be more sensitive to chemical insult than the rest of us; this is a known fact. Now, I would hope you do not extrapolate it to the extent which you have, because you must admit you are really practicing a form of genocide. Now, this again is a very extreme statement, but I would ask you to stop and think about what I am saying is that that ignoring of people who are hyper-sensitive to chemical insult can not be ignored. I would like to leave you with that thought.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I appreciate your representation, and I wouldn't want to leave the impression that I'm not concerned about that individual, because I am. I think there are a number of instances in this province where we are expending significant research dollars et cetera, to look at those specific concerns, to look and see if in fact industry has been the source of that particular person's or individual's concerns.

I appreciate what you are saying, and what I was going to say is perhaps in terms of some of these situations

if you can definitely find a cause and effect relationship of the nature which you are suggesting, that is, this particular industry is causing this type of an effect, I think that is where we have some of the difficulties is definitively saying this industry is causing an effect. But if we do and are able to make that type of connection, and if the nature of the connection is life threatening, I think we have to take the necessary action in those cases. Perhaps the type of people you are describing, because of their genetical background et cetera, if it is isolated to that one individual or a very few individuals, and it does not affect the rest of society, maybe that is a question which we have to address in terms of policy or programs; do we make industry spend X number of dollars in terms of pollution control equipment to handle that specific person's concern, or do we ask industry to make some arrangement with that individual in terms of some allocation to assist the person to move someplace else. Those are very difficult questions that we have to look at, but if you can definitely define the linkage, I think we have to address that specific concern.

DR. SHAW: One more thing, please keep in mind that to carry that out you will need the most sophisticated analytical equipment available to answer those questions.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Joanne Hedenstrom, Harvey Buckmaster next, and then Dr. Bentley.

MS. HEDENSTROM: I was interested to note your mention of nuclear radiation and scientific literacy. I think if you comment and exort to be scientific literacy, it behooves you to be scientifically literate, so I have three questions in connection with that. Number one, the depth of your studies in the field of radiation; number two, if you would study the data upon which you base your Three Mile Island analogy; and number three, are you justifying Three Mile Island because there have been discussions in Cabinet of a nuclear power plant in Alberta?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: I will answer the last question first; no, there has not been discussions in the Province of Alberta in Cabinet in regards to a nuclear power facility. The source of my information with regard to Three Mile Island radiation comes from the Nobel Laureate physicist Dr. Ruth Yallow.

MS. HEDENSTROM: In books or articles, where?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: In a speech which she gave.

MS. HEDENSTROM: Does it relate to a breakdown in the plant, or simply living near it?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: The specific was the people living within a ten mile radius of Three Mile Island, the specific incidents which there has been a great deal of media attention about. happened within the last few years, was that the same type of radiation exposure that a person would in fact receive in terms of flying at 35,000 feet in an aircraft for a period of time which I suggested flying from New York City to Edmonton.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: Dr. Buckmaster next.

DR. BUCKMASTER: I didn't know what the lady on my left was going to ask, and I was going to make a comment about that. The point really is, and she has exposed it, that sometimes you may be correct, but the problem is when there are problems as at Three Mile Island, the problem is not the amount of radiation it is what happened to the food chain that is ultimately the problem. It is very much the same as the DDT problem that resulted in concentrations in the food chain that escalates and then cause problems at some level with certain species which may include the human race. So I think one should be very careful about making these statements, because they are typical of what happens when one wants to pour oil on dangerous waters.

The question I had raised was a concern with water conservation. It seems to me you have talked about and there have been questions by several other persons with regard to water pollution and sewage processing and so on.

And the first approximation, the cost of carrying out these processes is proportional to the amount of fluid involved, and so if we have a glass of water, it is the amount of water that we consume that determines to a fair extent the cost involved at the other end of the system, the amount of sewage water we put into our system determines the cost of doing both, particularly the capital costs add some critical values. My question is, in the light of those comments, if you look at the domestic sector, one of the major sources of water waste I think is in the sewage of human waste, and we know that the five gallon flush can be decreased to, let's not argue about the amount, less than a quart per flush, and that's more than a factor of ten. And if that happens in domestic water, in terms of domestic situations in a typical household, those flushes constitute in the order of 50 percent of the water consumed in a household. So therefore, if one embarks on a water conservation program in terms of pluses, we would be able to cut the amount of water consumed by the order of two, therefore, I would ask you what is the government doing about encouraging water conservation in this process, and why have they not introduced a program of ,one, demonstrating in their own building water conserving toilets, and two, making them available at cost to the public rather than continuing to spend more and more money to encourage more and more waste?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, you make some good points, and one of the things we have suggested to the City of Calgary is to put water metering in their system. We find that Edmonton consumes about half the amount of water that Calgary does on a per capita basis, and Edmonton has metering of its water. So it is one of the things that we have suggested to the City of Calgary specifically in terms of their consumption of water. Now maybe there are some specific reasons why Calgary has been consuming more water than Edmonton other than having to do with the metering of water, but it has been suggested that water metering itself is probably one of the more effective ways of encouraging conservation.

But the other points you made are worthy of some consideration, one of the things that, given the economic climate we are in in the country today, in terms of regulation et cetera, I think perhaps a more effective way to implement that would be first to move into water metering process, because the person who consumes the water then is more conscious of how much water they use and will think of those conservation methods if they are concerned about what is the price to them in terms of their pocketbook. So rather than directing them to use certain types of methods, perhaps getting them in the pocketbook is the way that they will change and make those decisions in regards to the type of appliances et cetera they install in their home, whether it be a low flushing toilet, or other types of water conservation tool they may use in terms of showerheads, and that's another area, you can reduce the amount of flow on your showerhead et cetera. But I think getting to the pocketbook of the consumer is the way that you affect that conservation similarly as in terms of increasing the price of gasoline changed the consumer's habit in terms of buying automobiles that consume less gasoline, I think metering the water would have the same affect.

DR. BUCKHASTER: If I can make one comment about that, is that unfortunately, the existing, and I'm not making a case for any particular plan, because there are a variety of designs, but the problem is that since there are not enough of these being used they are very expensive, and my point really was it would take some government initiative to encourage the manufacturers to locate in the Province of Alberta to provide another industry to help to deal with the economic problems by making a work program which would go on for a long time, and in fact might even make Alberta a supplier of such devices for the rest of Canada and maybe elsewhere. I think, although I happen to come from Calgary,

and I am aware of the points you make, I happen to attempt to be a conserver, your point is well taken, but my point is that even Edmontonians could make a significant decrease and that would be even more important than what we have done. And I guess my further point is, if you believe that the consumer should pay, are you prepared to implement the same policy with regards to water for irrigation purposes?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: In that case there is a great deal of consumer resistance.

DR. BENTLEY: Fred Bentley, Science Advisory Council. Mr. Minister, in your original comments, you referred to many of the things concerning very technical and certainly the question and comments that have gone on the last half hour have indicated a great deal of this. I think you twice referred to the fact that Alberta can not do all of these investigations, and since there is an international community and an international responsibility in this regard. It is documented beyond question that Canada is one of the poorest supporters of research and development in all fields; they rank very lowly among the 20 O.E.C.D. countries. Given the resources and the assets of the Province of Alberta, I think it's reasonable that we could expect to make a fairly proportionate and even better than proportionate contribution to support research and development in this country. My question is, does the government of Alberta have a declared philosophy or policy of providing long term assured resources to enable this province to conduct an appropriate proportion of continuing research and development so that we can do our fair share, and in an efficient manner; because without consistent assured long term funding for our research, many of the activities are stop and go jerk operations that are very inefficient.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, I think, you know, I'm not sure how we compare, I don't have the statistics, but the government has made a significant commitment in terms of allocating research dollars, and I allude to the $300 million they have put into the Heritage Medical Research Foundation. We have targeted certain things, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority for example, there have been, I'm not sure of the exact level of funding to A.O.S.T.R.A., but I think it could be approaching, I wouldn't want to hazard a guess because I don't have the exact figure, but I think it is approaching between 150 to 200 millions of dollars there. So we have taken certain areas and targeted, we also have research dollars being allocated to major universities and the Alberta Environmental Research Centre through my department that looks at some inter-departmental type of research. And there is the Alberta Research Council also. Whether we are meeting the O.E.C.D. per capita suggested contribution to research I'm not certain, I think we are certainly faring as well, if not better than other provinces or perhaps the national government in terms of the present amount of research that we do fund.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: The Minister would like to leave at 9:30, we can entertain questions from Kenn Blom, and perhaps one more after that if the one by Kenn is not too long.

MR. BLOM: It won't be too long, it is basically related to two comments, and first of all the two comments relate to the fact that the funds that you speak of in terms of research, I think that one of the terms of reference referred to that is that none of these funds will be devoted to the study of preventative aspects of medical care. And I am just curious as to whether the fact we have a change in terms of our concerns in that area in the light of circumstances that have been generated over the last two or three years? Second, I would like to refer to your comments in terms of the Provincial Board of Health, and ask a question as to whether you are aware of the fact that we are now presently looking at changing the basic concept of the Provincial Board of Health. I am

hoping that you, representing Environment, will basically have some input into that change, and basically protecting the aspect of the environment which is very important in that area. The third question I will go back to is a question related to a year ago when then as a Minister, a rookie, I will agree, and very new to the portfolio, would make the statement that there would be an early decision in terms of recommendations of the noise report, and we have yet to hear of what those recommendations may be. Thank you.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: Well, with regard to the last question, officials of my department along with other officials of other departments have been reviewing recommendations from the noise panel, and I am not able at this time to specify a timeframe within which to respond. Certainly it is a priority which I have identified and have requested the inter-departmental review to conclude. I believe we are at the stage where we have finalized their review, they have submitted a report to me, and I will be taking that to my colleagues in terms of looking at the recommendations and response back to the specific recommendations.

Your first question I would have to check and see specifically again what the terms of reference are for the Heritage Medical Research Foundation, I will just check on that specifically to see whether or not the type of research that Dr. Shaw was suggesting could not take place under the aegis of that Medical Research Foundation. They are independent of the government in terms of their make up and the board which directs them.

Your other question with regard to the Provincial Board of Health, I am aware that discussions are taking place in terms of new legislation there, and in terms of the drafting of legislation, our department and myself will be involved in terms of the review of the proposal.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: One more question.

MRS. BROADBENT: I am Dorothy Broadbent from the Environment Protection Study Group. Are any negotiations presently underway with the Peigan Indian Band in regards to a dam on the Brocket Reserve?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: The original announcement gave the Peigans an opportunity to come forward with a proposal to us, and originally the timeframe was to be 18 months, now it is past three years. They have submitted a letter to me in terms of their conclusions, and of outlining concepts which they may wish to come forward with a proposal on. We are reviewing the type of concept that they are proposing, and we have not yet responded to them.

MRS. BROADBENT: Would you outline to us their questions?

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: They were contained in a letter which they provided to me, and I don't believe that I am in a position to publicly comment on the nature of the concepts they are putting forward to us. I don't think it would be beneficial for me to outline that at this point in time, but we will be responding to them.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: I think we will call a halt to the questions, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I would like to call on Louise Horstman to thank our speaker for his participation tonight.

THE HONOURABLE F. BRADLEY: If I could just make one concluding remark. When I spoke about scientific literacy, I never felt that, and I did not want to leave the impression with anybody that I am necessarily scientifically literate. The reason I say that is I think it would take, at least in terms of all the issues that I have to deal with I have to accept and respect the advice which I receive from some people with some pretty good credentials, I would say. And for me to have that level of scientific literacy that would be desirable in terms of the position that I hold, would take some time. But I think that we do have to, as a society, look at this question, and ensure that in terms

of our citizens and perhaps the education process that we make our citizens more aware of the type of thing that I have just been talking about and the importance of having accurate information and the proper interpretation of it.

MS. HORSTMAN: We want to thank you very much for being here tonight, we are sorry you did not bring your skis, we are sorry that you can not spend tomorrow with us, but we thank you for taking this time to come and be with us. I want to warn you about next year, you can't talk about the weather any more because the Chairman of PAC is a weather modifications scientist.

THE HONOURABLE P. BRADLEY: So he will be responsible for the weather from now on.

MS. HORSTMAN: Yes, at least for a year. It is customary for the person in my position to make a few parting remarks, and I would like to do that. In years past we have had some rather funny remarks made, rather pointed jokes made, and I thought about perhaps presenting you with a water purifier, but they are very expensive, and anyways, you were serious with us, so I would like to be serious with you. You are looking at in this group here, about 100 to 120 people who are very dedicated volunteers. Who are dedicated to looking for environmental, reasonable solutions to environmental problems. You are also looking at the Scientific Advisory Committee with a network of colleagues across Canada who are willing to help; and we would just like to ask you to consider this year making use of us. You pay for our meetings, we have some very nice meetings such as this one, and we don't really feel that you are getting your money's worth from us. We would like to ask you to consider sending a memo to PAC, to the co-ordinating committee saying, "What do you think of these alternatives; what are the problems here; what do you see as the problems here?" Or sending a letter to SAC saying, "What do you think of this report; what do you think of this research design?" and I think that you would be pleasantly surprised at the amount of co-operation and speed at which you get some results from us.

I would just like to say again, thank you for being with us, and we hope to work much more closely with you in 1984.

CHAIRMAN SHEMANCHUK: I would only like to add my thanks to the Minister for coming out here tonight and taking the questions as you did, and this now concludes our Session, the 13th Annual Joint Meeting of the Public Advisory Committee and the Environment Council of Alberta.

Now, the evening is all yours, thank you very much.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)

I, Loretta Mott, Ms., C.S.R.(A), Court Reporter, hereby certify that I attended the above Meeting and took faithful and accurate shorthand notes and the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my shorthand notes to the best of my skill and ability.

Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta this 10th day of January, A.D. 1984.

Loretta Mott, Ms., C.S.R.(A)
Court Reporter.

LM/lms

APPENDICES

MEMBERSHIP of the Public Advisory Committees

Sponsoring Organizations and Representatives

Alberta Association of Architects . . . . . Mr. F. Walicki
Alberta Association of Canadian Institute of Planners . . . . . Mr. C. Walker
Alberta Association of Landscape Architects . . . . . Mr. K.G. Carson
Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties . . . . . Mr. J. Glazier
Alberta Association of Registered Nurses . . . . . Mrs. C. Hooks
Alberta Beekeepers Association . . . . . Mr. R.P. McKenzie
Alberta Chamber of Commerce . . . . . Dr. A. Lamb
Alberta Chiropractic Association . . . . . Dr. R. Gehrke
Alberta Federation of Labour . . . . . Mr. R. Nielsen
Alberta Fish and Game Association . . . . . Mr. H. Fauser and Mr. G. Merrick
Alberta Forest Products Association . . . . . Mr. A. Rytz
Alberta Institute of Agrologists . . . . . Dr. R. Cairns
Alberta Irrigation Projects Association . . . . . Mr. G. Dudley
Alberta Lung Association . . . . . Mrs. D.J. Lewoniuk
Alberta Medical Association . . . . . Dr. K.W. Hodgins
Alberta Motion Picture Industry Association . . . . . Mr. D. Marshall
Alberta Motor Association . . . . . Mr. M.F. Colledge
Alberta Oil Sands Industry Environmental Association . . . . . Mr. S.E. Stephansson
Alberta Pharmaceutical Association . . . . . Mrs. J. Roschlaub
Alberta Public Health Association . . . . . Mr. K.J. Blom
Alberta Research Council . . . . . Dr. C. Wood
Alberta School Trustees Association . . . . . Mrs. M. Stephenson
Alberta Trappers Central Association . . . . . Mr. J. Wooders
Alberta Urban Municipalities Association . . . . . Mr. R. Hawkesworth
Alberta Veterinary Medical Association . . . . . Dr. C.W. Konschuh
Alberta Wheat Pool . . . . . Mr. P. Dobson
Alberta Wilderness Association . . . . . Mr. J. Eisenhauer
Alberta Women's Institute . . . . . Mrs. M. Goodwin
Archaeological Society of Alberta . . . . . Mr. G.F. Paschen
Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta . . . . . Mr. J.E. Staples
Calgary Chamber of Commerce . . . . . Mr. A. Chanin
Calgary Local Council of Women . . . . . Mrs. S. Neilson Pier
Canada West Foundation . . . . . Mr. D.K. Elton
Canadian Institute of Forestry . . . . . Dr. P. Woodard
Canadian Institute of Public Health Inspectors (Alberta Branch) . . . . . Mr. W. Irwin
Canadian Manufacturers' Association . . . . . Mr. A.M. Woffard
Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society (Alberta Centre) . . . . . Dr. L. Wojtiw
Canadian Nature Federation . . . . . Ms. M. Posey
Canadian Petroleum Association . . . . . Mr. G. Stewart
Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists . . . . . Mr. A. Garbutt
Canadian Water Resources Association (Alberta Chapter) . . . . . Mr. G. Sykes
Chemical Institute of Canada – Canadian Society of Chemical Engineers (Calgary Section) . . . . . Mr. D.A. Gemmill
Christian Farmers Federation . . . . . Mr. A. Wierenga
Citizens for Public Justice . . . . . Mrs. J. Krabbe
City of Calgary . . . . . Ms. J. Lewin
City of Camrose . . . . . Mr. D. Myrehaug
City of Drumheller . . . . . Mr. R. Romanetz
City of Edmonton . . . . . Mr. K.O. Higginbotham
City of Grande Prairie . . . . . Mr. E.G. Radbourne
City of Lethbridge . . . . . Alderman R.D. Tarleck
City of Lloydminster . . . . . Mrs. J. Sloan
City of Red Deer . . . . . Mr. D. Lawrence
City of St. Albert . . . . . Mr. A. Smith
City of Wetaskiwin . . . . . Mr. N. Carlson
Coal Association of Canada . . . . . Dr. J.B. Railton
Cold Lake Community Advisory Committee . . . . . Mr. D. Appleby
Community Planning Association of Canada (Alberta Division) . . . . . Ms. A. Parkinson
Consumers' Association of Canada . . . . . Mrs. E.S. Hunter and Mrs. M. Lutz
Council of Alberta Rural Ratepayers' Associations . . . . . Mr. J.C. Finlay
Edmonton Chamber of Commerce . . . . . Mr. G. Cameron
Electric Utility Planning Council . . . . . Mr. J. Prostebby
Energy Resources Conservation Board . . . . . Mr. E. Brushett
Entomological Society of Alberta . . . . . Mr. J.A. Shemanchuk
Federation of Alberta Naturalists . . . . . Mr. H. Gardner
Foothills Protective Association . . . . . Ms. L. Allison
Ft. Saskatchewan Regional Industrial Association . . . . . Mr. R.W. Lutz
Girl Guides of Canada, Alberta Council . . . . . Mrs. T.F. Clement
Grande Prairie Chamber of Commerce . . . . . Mr. B. MacDonald
Health Unit Association of Alberta . . . . . Mrs. M. Abdurahman

---

This listing represents the membership of the advisory committees as of November 1, 1983.

Law Society of Alberta ..... Prof. A.R. Lucas
Lloydminster Chamber of Commerce ..... Mr. J. Weaver
National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada
(Calgary/Banff Chapter) ..... Mr. A.C. Dunkley
National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada
(Edmonton Chapter) ..... Dr. G. Swinnerton
Native Outreach ..... Mr. R. Paul
Northern Alberta Association of Biological
Science Technicians ..... Mr. B. Kolenosky
Northwest Fisherman's Co-op ..... Mr. A. Emes
Outdoors Unlittered ..... Mrs. J. Finlay
Sierra Club of Alberta ..... Ms. P. Kariel
Strathcona Industrial Association ..... Mr. T. Lau
Unifarm ..... Mrs. E. Friesen
United Farmers of Alberta Co-operative Ltd. ..... Mr. H.G. Lunty
United Grain Growers Limited ..... Mr. A. Dickson
University Womens' Club of Edmonton
(Canadian Federation of University Women) ..... Mrs. P. Campbell
Urban Development Institute of Alberta ..... Mr. T. Priddle
Weed Control Research Society of Alberta ..... Dr. M. Hussain
Western Stock Growers' Association ..... Mr. E. Jarvis
Women of Unifarm ..... Mrs. K. Russell
Young Womens' Christian Association ..... Mr. R. Ireland

Non-Sponsored Members

The current list of unaffiliated members follows:

Mrs. S. Abercrombie
Mrs. D. Broadbent
Mr. W.D. Broughton
Mr. K. Driver
Mr. D. Dube
Dr. G.C.D. Griffiths
Ms. J. Hedenstrom
Dr. M. Kostuch
Mr. E. Kure
Mr. R.M. Richardson
Mr. W.K. Ross
Dr. R. Scace
Mrs. L. Scraba
Mr. I.D.F. Shaw

Science Advisory Committee Members

Dr. C.B. Beaty
Dr. C.F. Bentley
Dr. H. Buckmaster
Dr. S. Dalton
Dr. R.W. Davies
Prof. P. Dranchuk
Ms. L. Duncan
Dr. W.A. Fuller
Dr. J. Hackler
Ms. L.P. Horstman
Dr. R.K. Lane
Dr. A. Laycock
Dr. P. Mahaffy
Dr. R. Nursall
Dr. R.P. Pharis
Dr. W.E. Phillips
Dr. E. Prepas
Dr. D. Thompson
Dr. W.H. Vanden Born
Dr. T.S. Veeman
Mr. W.D. Wishart

Environmental Education Advisory Committee Members

Ms. S. Banks
Mr. B. Batycky
Mr. E. Berndt
Mrs. P. Campbell
Mr. G. Doherty
Mr. C. Dunkley
Dr. L. Fenna
Mrs. J. Finlay
Mrs. C. Gardner
Dr. J. Guay
Mr. B. Plesuk
Mr. D. Stoker
Ms. S. Washington

AGENDA for the 1983 Annual Joint Meeting

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL JOINT MEETING OF THE
PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND
ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL OF ALBERTA

8, 9, 10 December, 1983

Banff Centre, Banff, Alberta

THEME: Parks and Recreational Areas in Alberta

Chairman	Time	Activity	Speaker
Thursday, December 8			
	10:00 am 12:00 noon	Buses leaving Edmonton – Weber Centre (ECA Offices) Bus leaving Lethbridge – College Mall at Exotic Tours Ltd.	
	5:00 – 7:00 pm	Dinner in cafeteria at Banff Centre	
	7:30 pm	Registration – Max Bell Auditorium (Foyer)	
Dr. Guy Swinnerton	8:00 pm	Provincial Prospectives	
		A comparison of Alberta's, Ontario's and British Columbia's park policies.	Mr. Donn Cline – Alberta Dr. George Priddle - Ontario Mr. Denis Moffat – B.C.

Chairman	Time	Activity	Speaker
Friday, December 9			
	7:00 am	Breakfast in cafeteria	
	8:30 am	Official Opening	
		PAC Chairman's Remarks	Mr. Joe Shemanchuk
		Welcome from the Town of Banff	Mr. J. Vollmershausen
		Welcome from the ECA	Mr. Alistair Crerar
Mrs. Dorothy Broadbent	9:00 am	Tourism and the National Parks	
		A look at tourist-related environmental problems in the parks; the debate over the future of Banff; how Parks Canada reconciles tourism with environmental protection.	Mr. Steve Kun Dr. Bruce Leeson Mr. J. Vollmershausen Mr. David Morrison
	10:45 am	Refreshment Break	
Mr. Bob Richardson	11:00 am	Resolutions, Part I	
	12:00 noon	Lunch	
		Group Tables — Concerns	
Dr. Sheri Dalton	1:30 pm	Outdoor Recreation — Agencies and Their Responsibilities	
		Present and projected demand for recreational areas and parks of various kinds in the province and how various agencies (Tourism, AFS, regional planning commissions) aim to meet it.	Mr. Barry Rogers Mr. Wm. Shaw Ms. Jan Bloomfield
	3:15 pm	Refreshment Break	

Chairman	Time	Activity	Speaker
Friday, December 9			
Dr. Charlie Wood	3:30 pm	Water-Based Recreation	
		Environmental considerations of recreation on rivers and lakes (reservoir development, access to fishing spots, water quality).	Mr. Ted Dykstra Mr. Glen Clements Mr. Elmer Kure Mr. Cliff Lacey
		Private Dinner Arrangements	
		This will be a "FREE" Evening.	
		Two special films, courtesy of Guy Swinnerton and the World Parks Conference, will be shown Friday evening. Notices of location will be posted, and announced.	
		A Water Management display, by Alberta Environment, will be demonstrated on Friday evening, and on Saturday afternoon. Details will be available from the registration desk.	
Saturday, December 10			
	8:00 am	Breakfast – Buffet	
		Chairmen's Reports	
		ECA Research Division Report	Mr. Dave Buchwald
		Report from the Nominations Committee	Mr. Ron Whistance-Smith
		Candidates Forum	
		Election of Officers	

Chairman	Time	Activity	Speaker
Saturday, December 10			
Ms. Louise Horstman	10:00 am	Recreation-Related Environmental Problems in the Green Zone	Ms. Diane Pachal Mr. Eric Butters Mr. Paul Short
	12:00 noon	Lunch	Mr. Alistair Crerar
Mr. Bob Richardson	1:30 pm	Resolutions, Part II	
		Energy Study Group Status	
	2:30 pm	Adjournment	
		This will be a "FREE" Afternoon.	
		A Water Management display, by Alberta Environment, will be demonstrated on Friday evening, and on Saturday afternoon. Details will be available from the registration desk.	
	6:30 pm	Happy Half Hour	
	7:00 pm	Banquet	
		Introduction of Guest Speaker	Mr. Alistair Crerar
		Guest Speaker	Minister of the Environment
		In Appreciation	Ms. Louise Horstman
Sunday, December 11			
	7:00 am	Breakfast	
	9:00 am	Buses leaving for Edmonton, Lethbridge, and points in between.	

Guest Speakers

Mr. David Morrison, Banff Chamber of Commerce

Ms. Jan Bloomfield, Alberta Tourism

Mr. Eric Butters, Alberta Cattle Association

Mr. Glen Clements, Fisheries, Energy and Natural Resources

Mr. Donn Cline, ADM, Design and Implementation – Alberta Recreation and Parks

Mr. Ted Dykstra, Senior Regional Planner, Alberta Environment

Mr. Steve Kun, Director, Western Region, Parks Canada

Mr. Elmer Kure, Alberta Fish and Game Association

Mr. Cliff Lacey, Alberta Recreation and Parks

Dr. Bruce Leeson, Parks Canada

Mr. Denis Moffatt, Parks Programs, Planning and Research, British Columbia

Ms. Diane Pachal, Alberta Wilderness Association

Dr. George Priddle, University of Waterloo, Ontario

Mr. Barry Rogers, Alberta Forest Service

Mr. William Shaw, Red Deer Regional Planning Commission

Mr. Paul Short, Energy and Natural Resources

Mr. J. Vollmershausen, Superintendent, Banff National Park

ATTENDEES at the Annual Joint Meeting

Advisory Committee Members

Abbey, Don H.
Appleby, Don
Batycky, William P.
Bentley, C. F.
Berndt, Erich
Blom, Kenn
Broadbent, Dorothy
Buckmaster, H.A.
Cameron, G.R.
Campbell, Pam
Carlson, Norman L.
Delton, Sheri A.
Dobson, Parke
Dudley, George T.
Dunkley, A. Chris
Fauser, Horst
Finlay, Joy
Finlay, J.C.
Gardner, Corlaine
Goodwin, Mary
Griffiths, Graham C.D.
Gusy, Julian
Hackler, Jim
Hedenstrom, Joanne I.
Horstman, Louise
Hunter, Betty
Irwin, Bill
Kariel, Pat
Klute, Lorna
Kostuch, Martha
Krabbe, Jenny
Kure, Elmer
Lane, George A.
Laychuk, Barbara
Lewin, Joan E.
McKenzie, Bob
Mahaffy, Peter
Norrie, Douglas
Paschen, Elizabeth E.
Richardson, Robert M.
Romanetz, Ray
Ross, W.K.
Seymour, P.N.D.
Shaw, Ian
Shaw, R.K.
Shemanchuk, J.A.
Shewchuk, T.R.
Sloan, Jean H.
Smith, Alan
Staples, John E.
Swinnerton, Guy S.
Washington, Susie
Whitstance-Smith, Ron
White, Norman
Wierenga, Andrew
Wojtiw, Lubomir
Wood, J.C.

Visitors

Buchwald, Guadalupe
Buckmaster, Margaret
Conroy, Mike
Dilay, Jim
Dobson, Ardis
Dudley, Lillian H.
Kovk, Thomas M.
Meier, Betty L.
Merrick, Betty
Millson, Ron
Shaw, Neil

Environment Council of Alberta Staff Members

Buchwald, Dave
Free, Brian
Kaiser, Elaine
Lilley, John
Nelson, Ken
Sanderson, Kim
Webb, Calvin

RESOLUTIONS Passed at the 1983 Annual Joint Meeting

RESOLUTION 1

I. Government Grant Support for Leadership and Environmental Educational Programs

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT Government maintain or expand grants which support those efforts of citizen groups that (1) inform the public about environmental issues and concerns, and (2) provide leadership development in the areas of environmental education and/or citizen participation in environmental decision making.

III. Background:

In the past, various government departments have provided some funding to volunteer citizen environmental groups for the production of newsletters and special publications, and for conferences and workshops. The conferences and workshops provide opportunities for the development of leadership and for public dissemination of environmental concerns and recommendations. The published material serves as a resource for public environmental education, since such material is often sent gratis to school and public libraries. Many groups have benefitted from government grants in the past. One fine example is the publication called ***Rivers on Borrowed Time.***[1]

As a result of current cutbacks in government spending, there will be strong temptations to eliminate programs of the nature described above. In a recent report commissioned by the Environment Council of Alberta (***Attitudes Toward The Environment: A Comparison of Six Surveys Spanning Six Years***[2]), it was found that the Alberta public expressed a great deal of confidence in the performance of citizen environmental groups in the province. To enable citizen groups to continue and to expand these services provided to the public, there is a need for grant support by government agencies and departments. Some appropriate departments to provide the required funding are Alberta Environment, Alberta Recreation and Parks, and Alberta Energy and Natural Resources.

IV. References:

[1] Eisenhauer, J. and B. Kolar. 1982. ***Rivers on Borrowed Time – Eight Great Alberta Waterways, and What We Must do to Save Them.*** Alberta Wilderness Association, Calgary. 29 pages.

[2] Kelly, M.L. 1982. ***Attitudes Toward the Environment: A Comparison of Six Surveys Spanning Six Years.*** Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton. 25 pages.

V. To be Directed to:

Minister of Environment
Minister of Recreation and Parks
Minister of Education
Minister of Energy and Natural Resources

VI. Proposed by the Environmental Education Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION 2

I. Research into Lining of Irrigation Ditches

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT the Government of Alberta, in co-operation with the commercial producers and marketers of fly ash, undertake a research project to evaluate the use of lining materials containing fly ash, to reduce seepage from irrigation water carriers, dams, and reservoirs.

III. Background:

Great amounts of scarce waters are lost yearly due to seepage from irrigation waterways. This has led to salinization of land adjacent to these carriers. Lining these carriers with concrete has not been very successful due to frost damage. It is believed that fly ash mixtures might effectively reduce water loss by seepage and still be flexible enough to withstand frost upheaval. Fly ash is readily available in Alberta. Production in 1978 was 1.26 million tons, of which less than 10 percent was used.

Fly ash, a by-product of coal-fired plants, has limited use at the present time. Some of the uses of fly ash are:

1) additive to concrete
2) extender in plastic rubber
3) road stabilizer
4) filler in mineral wool insulation.

Notable properties of fly ash which support its consideration are:

1) impervious to water (sealant-repellant)
2) flexibility – reducing frost damage
3) good compaction and stabilizing qualities
4) self-cementing
5) mixes well with cement, lime, or soil
6) durable
7) available and cheap

Some areas of research which might be undertaken are:

1) Use of fly ash as an ingredient to be mixed with soil by spraying on the banks, or by mixing with the soil and compacting a layer lining the ditch or dam.

2) Formulations of fly ash with air-setting synthetic binders for spray application or pressure injection.

3) Incorporating fly ash into the base of the concrete-lined ditches.

4) Varying the content of fly ash in the concrete mixtures for lining ditches.

This research could be a project of the Farming for the Future research program.

IV. References:

Presentation by Mr. Al Slessor, Sales Manager, TransAlta Flyash Limited to the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group, March 1, 1983. Available from the ECA Library.

V. To be Directed to:

Minister of Agriculture
Minister of Environment
Caucus Committee on Irrigation

Copies to:

Agricultural Research Council
St. Mary Irrigation District
Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District

VI. Proposed by the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group

RESOLUTION 3

I. Recycling of Lubricating Oils

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT Alberta Environment adopt more effective means to promote public acceptance of the need to reduce pollution and conserve petroleum supplies by the regular recycling of used lubricating oils.

III. Background:

Although the Government of Alberta has accepted the principle that the recycling of used lubricating oils is a desirable goal and has offered some inducement to municipal authorities to install collecting tanks for this purpose, its efforts have fallen short of achieving any significant response from the general public. This presumably is due as much to a lack of public awareness of the need to conserve this valuable resource, as to the inadequacy of collection facilities.

The long history of satisfactory performance of recycled oils in the railroad systems provides ample evidence of their suitability for general use. In a number of countries, recovered oils have been used interchangeably with "new" oils for many years with no noticeable adverse effects. The "lube-oil" fraction may even represent the most valuable portion of the petroleum product output.

Alberta Environment must adopt a more aggressive public awareness program to encourage the public to support the concept of recycling used lubricating oils. It must also promote the expansion of the used oil collection system.

IV. References:

Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. 1979. "Resolution 3 – A Used Oil Recycling Act." ***1979 Resolutions.*** Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton. Pages 8-10.

Non-Renewable Resources Study Group. 1979. "Resolution 4 – Use of Lubricating Oil on Roads." ***1979 Resolutions.*** Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton. Pages 11-13.

Anon. 1980. Turbo Resources Brief to the Hazardous Waste Management Hearings. Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton.

Environment Council of Alberta. 1980. ***Hazardous Waste Management in Alberta: Report and Recommendations.*** Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton. 253 pages.

Sykes, G. 1978. ***Recycling: Two Alberta Case Studies.*** MSc. Thesis. University of Calgary. Available from the ECA Library.

V. To be Directed to:

Minister of Environment

VI. Proposed by the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group

RESOLUTION 4

I. Public Hearings on Water Management

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT the Lieutenant-Governor in Council direct the Environment Council of Alberta to conduct public hearings on water management in Alberta.

III. Background:

Public input is required not only for specific development projects (as specified by the Department of Environment in its document ***Water Resource Management Principles for Alberta,*** but on the overall issues and policies relating to water management as well.

The Environment Council of Alberta has considerable involvement with water management issues and maintains an infrastructure to conduct public hearings.

The terms of reference for the hearings should include a review of:

- the legislation, standards, and enforcement related to the management of water quality and water quantity
- water quality objectives
- water quality monitoring
- departmental responsibilities for water management
- water management planning and policies
- the pros and cons of interbasin transfer
- the need for water pricing
- other matters relating to water management.

IV. References:

Alberta Environment. n.d. ***Water Resource Management Principles for Alberta.*** Alberta Department of Environment. 16 pages.

V. To be Directed to:

Lieutenant-Governor in Council
Minister of Environment

VI. Proposed by the Pollution Study Group

RESOLUTION 5

I. The Impacts of Pollution on Health

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT the Lieutenant-Governor in Council direct the Environment Council of Alberta to hold public hearings on methods and procedures of dealing with environment-related human health concerns.

III. Background:

Albertans are expressing increasing concern with the impact of environmental factors on their health.

Pincher Creek (Twin Butte) is an example of an area that has had an

unresolved environmental health problem for many years. Health problems should be dealt with in a logical and systematic manner.

These public hearings should review current practices and recommend new procedures where desirable. The terms of reference for the hearings should include a review of:

- methods available to characterize environmental concerns
- the relationship of environmental factors to human health
- sources of contamination affecting human health
- the existing legislation, standards, and enforcement related to the management of environmental factors
- literature
- public education
- any other related matters.

IV. References:

Medicine Hat Health Unit. 1982. ***Peterson's Case Log.*** Medicine Hat Health Unit report on the Peterson family. Various pagination. Available from the ECA Library.

SAGE Institute. 1983. ***Final Report – Sage Pincher Creek Health Study.*** 4 vols. Energy Resources Conservation Board, Edmonton. Available from the ECA Library.

V. To be Directed to:

Premier
Lieutenant-Governor in Council
Minister of Environment
Minister of Workers' Health, Safety and Compensation
Minister of Social Services and Community Health
Energy Resources Conservation Board

VI. Proposed by the Pollution Study Group

RESOLUTION 6

I. Hazardous Waste Management

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT the Alberta Government actively pursue a solution to the hazardous waste problem in Alberta in accordance with its ***Position Paper on Industrial and Special Waste Management,*** 1982.

III. Background:

After Chem Securities was selected to build and operate Alberta's hazardous waste disposal facility, they were acquired by a company which allegedly has a record of environment-related violations and convictions. In addition, considerable difficulty is being experienced by provincial authorities in deciding on a suitable site on which to build the facility. Both these situations remain unresolved. There is now a fear on the part of many individuals that the will of the provincial government to effectively pursue this issue has weakened.

In January 1982 the provincial government brought forward the above mentioned position paper and later in the year passed Bill 35 – the Special Waste Management Corporation Act.

To date, no evidence has come forward to indicate that a site for the disposal plant has been chosen and/or that plans for its construction are under way.

IV. References:

Reid, Crowther and Partners, Ltd. 1980. ***Hazardous Wastes in Alberta: An Inventory and Review of Practices and Technology.*** 3 vols. Waste Management Branch, Alberta Department of Environment.

Government of Alberta. 1982. ***Position Paper on Industrial and Special Waste Management.*** Available from the ECA Library.

Special Waste Management Corporation Act. S.A. 1982, c. S-21.5.

Environment Council of Alberta. 1980. ***Hazardous Waste Management in Alberta: Report and Recommendations.*** Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton. 253 pages.

V. To be Directed to:

Minister of Environment

VI. Proposed by the Renewable Resources Study Group

RESOLUTION 7

I. Joint Site for Edmonton Municipal and Alberta Hazardous Waste Processing Facility

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT the City of Edmonton and the Province of Alberta jointly acquire a site or sites in or near Edmonton on which to operate a municipal solid waste (MSW) incinerator and a hazardous waste (HW) processing facility, with the noncombustible residues from both to be landfilled at a separate location.

III. Background:

Efforts by both the City and the Province to acquire sites for MSW and HW facilities have not been successful, due to public opposition. Benefits could result from a joint venture:

1) The process of site selection, approval, acceptance, etc. would only have to be carried out once.

2) Since the majority of Alberta's hazardous waste is generated in the Edmonton area, both the cost and hazard of transporting raw (unprocessed) wastes would be greatly reduced if the facilities were located in or near Edmonton. The greatest volume of the industrial wastes are oil based and present no problems when used as fuel in a suitably designed facility.

3) If these waste-processing facilities were to be designed without an on-site landfill, then the non-combustible, insoluble residues from both the MSW and HW processing operation could be transported to a remote and more easily obtained landfill site. The life of the processing site would therefore be extended. Any residue from the hazardous waste facility requiring "secure" landfilling could be handled separately.

4) Some servicing costs for both facilities could be shared if they occupied one site. These would include:
   a) access roads
   b) utilities
   c) fencing and security
   d) some personnel and equipment.

5) Energy, in the form of waste heat, would be exchanged between the facilities and sold to adjacent industries, or would be an incentive for the location of energy-consuming industries in the future. The sale of energy would reduce the operating costs for the facilities.

6) The technology for such a facility is available from operating installations in Europe.

It is recognized that one criticism of the idea of a landfill located at a different site than the processing facilities is that they would probably be in different municipalities. This would result in one community being asked to accept waste for burial without benefits such as jobs and tax revenues.

This impediment could be resolved by negotiation, possibly by offering an annual contribution to the municipality's treasury.

IV. References:

E.H. Bolstad, P.Eng. and J.E. Sworder, P.Eng., Consulting Engineers, Edmonton. Pers. Com.

Reid, Crowther and Partners, Ltd. 1980. ***Hazardous Wastes in Alberta: An Inventory and Review of Practices and Technology.*** 3 vols. Waste Management Branch, Alberta Department of Environment.

Gerry Wright. Alderman, City of Edmonton. Pers. Com.

Proceedings of the 24th Annual Workshop and Banquet of the Oldman River Regional Planning Commission, 1983. (Theme: Dealing with Waste.) Oldman River Regional Planning Commission, Lethbridge. 78 pages.

For information about rotary kiln incinerators, contact: Engineering Products Division, Dominion Bridge Sulzer Inc., 600 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario M4W 3B8, ph. (416) 964-3703. Canadian suppliers of Von Roll rotary kiln incinerators.

V. To be Directed to:

Minister of Environment
The Mayor and Council, City of Edmonton

VI. Proposed by the Renewable Resources Study Group

RESOLUTION 8

I. Quiet Communities Directorate

II. Be It Resolved:

THAT the Government of Alberta establish the Quiet Communities Directorate, as recommended in the Environment Council of Alberta's ***Report and Recommendations*** on noise, with the mandate to implement the recommendations contained in that report.

III. Background:

The effects of noise on our health include annoyance, stress, interruption of sleep, and interference with speech. Noise costs society millions of dollars in lost productivity. Excessive noise pervades our environment and loss of hearing caused by exposure to noise is a compensable disease. Many jurisdictions in North America consider a loss of 25 dB a significant handicap.

Current responsibilities for noise control are still split between various government departments, with no coordination existing among them, despite the year-old recommendation for the formation of a "Quiet Communities Directorate."

IV. References:

Environment Council of Alberta. 1982. ***Public Hearings on Noise in Alberta: Report and Recommendations.*** Environment Council of Alberta, Edmonton. 175 pages.

V. To be Directed to:

Minister of Environment

VI. Proposed by the Urban Environment Study Group

MINUTES of Meetings with the Minister

Meeting of Wednesday, January 12th, 1983

The meeting was held in the offices of the Environment Council of Alberta.

Present:

Mr. Joe Shemanchuk, Chairman, PAC
Ms. Randelin Pretty, Executive Secretary, PAC

The Hon. Fred Bradley, Minister, Alberta Environment

Ms. Louise Horstman, Vice-Chairman, PAC
Mrs. Betty Hunter, Chairman, Non-Renewable Resources Study Group
Mrs. Marcelle Lutz, representing Urban Environment Study Group
Mr. Bob Richardson, Chairman, Resolutions Committee
Mr. Ian Shaw, Chairman, Energy Study Group
Dr. Guy Swinnerton, Chairman, Environment Protection Study Group
Dr. Terry Veeman, Chairman, Science Advisory Committee
Dr. Lubomir Wojtiw, Chairman, Pollution Study Group
Dr. Charlie Wood, Chairman, Renewable Resources Study Group

Guests:

Dr. Sheri Dalton, Urban Environment Study Group
Dr. Martha Kostuch, Pollution Study Group

Representing the Environment Council of Alberta:

Mr. A.D. Crerar, Chief Executive Officer
Mr. W.A. (Bill) Flook, Director, Liaison
Mr. Ken Nelson, Communications Officer

The Minister spoke to each member of the Co-ordinating Committee before the meeting began.

Mr. A.D. Crerar, Chief Executive Officer of the Environment Council, thanked the Minister for attending this afternoon and summarized the objective and structure of the Environment Council of Alberta and the Public Advisory Committee on the Environment for the Minister's information.

The Chairman opened the discussion with the Minister by requesting his input as to how he felt these should be conducted. The Minister felt that he would like the following points followed:

1) Quarterly meetings (four per year).
2) A list of issues to be discussed forwarded to him prior to the meetings.
3) Minutes of meetings to be sent to him for review before distribution.
4) Meeting dates kept open for adjustment according to his availability.

The Chairman opened the meeting for discussion regarding the following issues:

Hazardous Waste Plant Site – The Minister advised that a site has not been chosen as yet. The following five locations are being looked at: Swan Hills, Ryley, Consort, Veteran, and Youngstown. The site will facilitate only Alberta-generated waste but would consider helping any neighbor in an emergency situation to dispose of their waste. The Cabinet will make the final decision.

Agricultural Land Base Hearings – The Minister was confident that this panel would be in place in early February.

Lodgepole Blowout – The ERCB will hold an investigation. There will be an announcement shortly as to when it will be held. He will await the results before deciding whether additional inquiries are required. In any case, the ERCB itself may decide to recommend further inquiries.

Contingency Plans for Future Blowouts in Alberta – The Minister felt that these were already in place by the ERCB as it is part of their mandate.

Slave River Hydro-electric Project – The Minister advised the decision to proceed has been made but it must be remembered that a project of this size proceeds in stages. At any stage a decision could be made to abandon the project.

Water Resources Commission – The terms of this commission have been set with legislation to occur at the Spring Session. Mr. H. Kroeger has been appointed chairman with Mr. Bob Elliot from Grande Prairie as a member of the commission. Membership will consist of ADMs from Agriculture, Environment, Economic Development, and Municipal Affairs, and three members from the public, one of whom is Justice Porter. The Minister felt that PAC could certainly submit the name of a suggested member to the Commission if it wished to do so.

Noise Hearings – A meeting between the noise panel and the Minister is set for next week.

Issues for PAC to Look At – The Minister advised that he did not have any issue at this time for PAC but was anxious to keep present communications open.

Future Hearings – The Minister has already had one meeting with Mr. Crerar to discuss this and another meeting is scheduled for February.

Meeting of Thursday, June 30th 1983

The meeting was held in the offices of the Environment Council of Alberta.

Present:

Mr. Joe Shemanchuk, Chairman, PAC
Ms. Randalin Pretty, Executive Secretary, PAC

The Hon. Fred Bradley, Minister, Alberta Environment

Dr. Lochen Bakshi, Chairman, Urban Environment Study Group
Dr. Julien Guay, Chairman, Environmental Education Study Group
Ms. Louise Horstman, Vice-Chairman, PAC
Mrs. Betty Hunter, Chairman, Non-Renewable Resources Study Group
Mr. Bob Richardson, Chairman, Resolutions Committee
Dr. Guy Swinnerton, Chairman, Environment Protection Study Group
Dr. Terry Veeman, Chairman, Science Advisory Committee
Dr. Lubomir Wojtiw, Chairman, Pollution Study Group
Dr. Charlie Wood, Chairman, Renewable Resources Study Group

Representing the Environment Council of Alberta:

Mr. W.A. (Bill) Flook, Director, Liaison

The Minister arrived and greeted each member of the Co-ordinating Committee.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. Bradley and opened the meeting for discussion with regard to the following issues:

Gulf Plant – Pincher Creek – The Minister advised them that the Twin Butte Soil and Water Evaluation Task Force has been set up to look into this problem. When the final report from this Task Force is made available it will be made public. He also stated that Health and Welfare Canada have compiled a report on cadmium but this is not available as yet.

Environment Advertising – The Minister agreed that it was important to make the public more aware of environmental concerns in Alberta. Environment Week would be an ideal vehicle for this purpose and he hopes to start looking at this in the fall in preparation for 1984.

Hazardous Waste Sites – This remains a high priority program and it is hoped to resolve it by December. The original five sites are still under consideration for locating this facility. Also, the status of Chem Securities Ltd. is under review by the Attorney General's department.

Private Sewage Disposal – Following an open discussion on this subject, the Minister agreed that this is a serious and growing problem and he will be conferring with his colleagues to ascertain the most viable way of confronting it.

Development of New One-Industry Communities – The Minister advised that government does not want a Grande Cache situation again. They are working very hard at not allowing this type of community to develop anywhere in Alberta.

Possible Air Pollution Hearings – A decision on the possibility of public hearings on air pollution has not been reached as yet. There are a number of public hearings set up now and these have to be completed before any additional ones can be looked at.

Diamond Shamrock – The Minister advised he is drafting a reply to the Pollution Study Group regarding this item.

Slave River Hydro Project – The Minister advised that many aspects are involved in this project and progress is very slow at this time. He did not know when the guidelines would be released.

1982 Resolutions – The Minister advised that responses will be forwarded as soon as possible.

Procter and Gamble Licence – A decision will be made before the end of July.

Mount Allen – A committee is now looking into the environmental and wildlife impacts that Olympic Games developments may have in this area.

The Chairman thanked the Minister for attending today's meeting.

ANNUAL REPORTS of the Public Advisory Committees

CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

Report from the Chairman – Mr. Joe Shemanchuk

The Co-ordinating Committee of the Public Advisory Committees met every month. Many varied issues were brought before the committee by the study groups, SAC, EEAC, and concerned citizens.

Some of the highlights of the year's activities were:

1) Met with the Minister of Environment, the Hon. Fred Bradley, in January and in June. Very informative and frank discussions took place on topics dealing with hazardous waste plant sites, agricultural land base hearings, the Lodgepole blowout, contingency plans for future gas well blowouts in Alberta, the Slave River hydro-electric project, the Water Resources Commission, noise hearings, environment advertising, possible hearings on air pollution, the Procter and Gamble licence, and the environmental and wildlife impacts on Mount Allen. The Minister responded to all of the resolutions of 1982 and has indicated that he would attempt to meet with the Co-ordinating Committee on a regular basis.

2) Mr. Henry Kroeger, Chairman, Water Resources Commission, met with the Co-ordinating Committee in March. He outlined the function and purpose of the Water Resources Commission and stated that he wanted to keep avenues of communication open between the Public Advisory Committees and the Commission and requested that a contact person be assigned by PAC for this purpose. The Co-ordinating Committee named the PAC Secretariat as the contact channel to provide continuity from year to year even though members on the Co-ordinating Committee change. At this meeting all of the members of the commission had not been named and the Co-ordinating Committee suggested that the Commission consider a representative named by PAC. The meeting with Mr. Kroeger was very informal, informative, and frank.

3) Mr. Bob Cronkhite, Executive Director, Water Resources Commission, met with the Co-ordinating Committee in August. He outlined the make up of the Water Resources Commission which is as follows:

Secretariat
Chairman: Mr. Henry Kroeger, MLA
Executive Director: Mr. Bob Cronkhite, Past Deputy Minister, Transportation
Director of Research: Mr. Rick Mills, Engineer

Members
Dr. Robert Elliot, MLA
Mr. Robin Ford, Assistant Deputy Minister, Municipal Affairs
Mrs. Margaret Lounds, member, various citizens' advisory committees
Mr. Kim MacKenzie, Consultant
Mr. Peter Melnychuk, Assistant Deputy Minister, Alberta Environment
Hon. Marsh Porter, retired judge
Dr. Brian Sullivan, Assistant Deputy Minister, Economic Development

Mr. Cronkhite informed the Co-ordinating Committee that the Water Resources Commission is strictly an advisory commission reporting to the Executive Council, but can provide minimal funds for investigation into water management problems. The commission will be investigating the development of a province-wide inventory of wetlands, development of a program to look at irrigation, water quality, irrigation allocation, and a possibility of public hearings on water quality, quantity, and management.

3) A motion was passed recommending that the Resolutions Committee become a standing committee that will receive resolutions directly from the study groups to be priorized and commented on with assistance from the ECA Research Department and SAC before presenting them to the Co-ordinating Committee. A further motion was passed that the Co-ordinating Committee take responsibility for restricting the number of yearly resolutions to be presented at the annual joint meeting.

4) A submission was made to the Lodgepole blowout inquiry. This comprehensive, thoroughly investigated, and well-presented document made a significant contribution to the inquiry.

5) Eight resolutions were reviewed for presentation at the annual joint meeting.

6) The Earle L. Snider report on the Twin Butte health study and the Sage analysis report have been received and transmitted to the appropriate study groups for study.

I wish to thank Ms. Louise Horstman for chairing the Co-ordinating Committee meetings in my absence and for organizing the annual joint meeting.

I wish to acknowledge with thanks the excellent assistance received from Ms. Randy Pretty, Joyce Degelder, and Elaine Kaiser.

Joe Shemanchuk
Chairman, Co-ordinating Committee

Members of the Co-ordinating Committee

Mr. J. Shemanchuk – Chairman
Ms. L. Horstman – Vice-Chairman
Mr. R. Whitstance-Smith – Past Chairman

Dr. G.S. Swinnerton – Environment Protection Study Group
Dr. L. Bakshi – Urban Environment Study Group
Mr. B. Richardson – Resolutions Committee
Mrs. E.S. Hunter – Non-Renewable Resources Study Group
Dr. C. Wood – Renewable Resources Study Group
Mr. I.D.F. Shaw – Energy Conservation Study Group
Dr. L. Wojtiw – Pollution Study Group
Dr. D. Thompson – Science Advisory Committee
Dr. J. Guay – Environmental Education Advisory Committee

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report from the Chairman – Dr. Julian Guay

This has been a very active year for the Environmental Education Advisory Committee. We had a total of eight meetings in Calgary.

1) At the first meeting in February, a new chairman and vice-chairman were elected for the EEAC.

2) A letter was directed to the Minister with reference to making the public aware of environmental issues through a media advertising campaign. At the co-ordinating meeting of June 30th, the Minister agreed that it was important to make the public more aware of environmental concerns in Alberta. He felt that Environment Week would be an ideal vehicle for this purpose and he hopes to start looking at this in preparation for 1984.

3) A resolution entitled "Government Grant Support for Leadership and Educational Efforts of Citizen Environmental Groups" was drafted and forwarded through the proper channels.

4) Over the past year, several long-standing members of EEAC resigned and were replaced by new members.

5) The new members brought a revitalized direction to the committee. Considerable time was utilized in re-examining the role of the EEAC, developing a priorized list of projects/actions/resolutions. Dan Stoker presented a methodology for dealing with these projects, actions, and resolutions.

6) Some of the guest speakers invited to the EEAC this past year were Linda Duncan on "Environment Law", Betty Hunter on "Environment Week", Bill Washburn on "Education Committee" (a subcommittee of the Calgary Olympic Development Committee), and Reg Houghton on "Inadequacies and Adequacies in Environmental Education Curriculums."

7) A letter was drafted and sent to the various agencies and resulted in the development of a co-ordinating position for Environment Week 1984.

8) Planning is well under way for an Alberta Invitational Environmental Education Conference for 1984.

In summary, it has been a very ambitious and successful year for the Environmental Education Advisory Committee.

I would like to thank all the members of the EEAC for their tremendous efforts this past year. I feel this year has been a genuine committee endeavor from the standpoint that the actual tasks were initiated and completed by many different members.

A very special thanks to Randalin Pretty for all her help and extra effort which enabled the Environmental Education Advisory Committee to function smoothly.

Thank you.

Dr. Julian Guay
Chairman, Environmental Education Advisory Committee

Members of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee

Dr. J. Guay – Chairman
Dr. L. Bakshi – Representing Urban Environment Study Group
Mr. B. Batycky
Mr. E. Berndt
Mrs. J. Crook*
Dr. S. Dalton* – Representing Urban Environment Study Group
Mr. G. Doherty
Mr. C. Dunkley – Representing Non-Renewable Resources Study Group
Dr. L. Fenna
Mrs. J. Finlay – Representing Energy Study Group
Mrs. C. Gardner
Mr. D. Gemmill* – Representing Pollution Study Group
Mr. J. Glazier* – Representing Environment Protection Study Group
Mrs. E.S. Hunter* – Representing Non-Renewable Resources Study Group
Mr. G. Lane – Representing Pollution Study Group
Mr. L. McKibben*
Mr. B. Plesuk
Mr. G. Shaw*
Mr. T. Shewchuk – Representing Renewable Resources Study Group
Mr. A. Smandych*
Mr. D. Stoker
Dr. B. Westbury*
Mr. W. Wismer*

* No longer on EEAC

SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report from the Chairman – Dr. Dixon Thompson

The Science Advisory Committee met December 17, 1982, and four times during 1983 – March 16, June 2, September 28, and November 9. As in past years, SAC continued to deal with environmental issues which were brought before it by the study groups and the ECA as well as with matters originating within the committee itself. The following discussion and actions were undertaken:

1) SAC reviewed the policy and research implications of the Lodgepole blowout which resulted in several activities.

a) Letters were sent to the Canadian Petroleum Association and the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada requesting that the petroleum industry consider putting into place contingency plans to deal with blowout situations as an industry response analogous to current contingency plans for oil spills.

b) Letters were sent to the National Research Council of Canada, the Alberta Research Council, the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, and the Research Secretariat of Alberta Environment requesting that high priority be given to research on the effects on human health from short- and long-term exposure to H_2S and SO_2.

c) Comments were submitted on the research proposals of the PAC-initiated study on the environmental impact of the blowout. The report from that study, ***Environmental Assessment Lodgepole Sour Gas Well Blowout, for the Public Advisory Committee*** by Monenco Consultants Ltd., Calgary, is under review.

2) Monitoring of several water resource management issues in Alberta continued, including:

a) review of the Slave River Hydro-electric Power Development,

b) further discussion of the Alberta Environment document, ***Water Resource Management Principles for Alberta,***

c) drainage issues and research,

d) discussion of possible SAC assessment of forthcoming SSRB water planning studies and public hearings.

3) SAC initiated an internal review of the Snider report and the Sage report on Pincher Creek area health problems.

4) A member of SAC reviewed the submission by Dr. Bauman on the jurisdiction and powers of the ERCB in sour gas related matters.

5) Watching briefs were maintained on: the Blackfoot Grazing Reserve, hazardous waste management, drilling in the Eastern Slopes, and nuclear energy for tar sands.

6) The fall grizzly hunt issue and the proposed fish and wildlife policy for Alberta are under review.

7) SAC will monitor the public hearings on maintaining and expanding the agricultural land base in Alberta.

8) SAC reviewed and provided comments on 1983 PAC resolutions.

9) SAC's roles, strategies, tactics, and priorities are being revised and updated for 1984.

SAC wishes to acknowledge the excellent support assistance of the PAC Secretariat – in particular, Ms. Randalin Pretty, Ms. Elaine Kaiser, and Ms. Joyce Degelder.

Dr. Terry Veeman (Chairman to August 1983)

Dr. Dixon Thompson
Chairman, Science Advisory Committee

Members of the Science Advisory Committee

Dr. D. Thompson (Chairman) – Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary
Dr. C.B. Beaty – Department of Geography, University of Lethbridge
Dr. C.F. Bentley – Department of Soil Science, University of Alberta
Dr. H. Buckmaster – Department of Physics, University of Calgary
Dr. S. Dalton – Concordia College
Dr. B.P. Dancik* – Department of Forest Science, University of Alberta
Dr. R.W. Davies – Department of Biology, University of Calgary
Prof. P. Dranchuk – Department of Mineral Engineering, University of Alberta
Ms. L. Duncan – Environmental Law Centre
Dr. W.A. Fuller – Department of Zoology, University of Alberta
Dr. H.W. Habgood* – Alberta Research Council
Dr. J. Hackler – Department of Sociology, University of Alberta
Ms. L. Horstman – Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists
Dr. R.P. Lane – Environment Canada
Dr. A. Laycock – Department of Geography, University of Alberta
Dr. P. Mahaffy – Department of Chemistry, King's College
Dr. R. Nursall – Department of Zoology, University of Alberta
Dr. R.P. Pharis – Department of Biology, University of Calgary
Dr. W.E. Phillips – Department of Rural Economy University of Alberta
Dr. E. Prepas – Department of Zoology, University of Alberta
Dr. F.W. Schwartz* – Department of Geology, University of Alberta
Dr. W.H. Vanden Born – Department of Plant Science, University of Alberta
Dr. T.S. Veeman – Department of Economics, University of Alberta
Mr. W.D. Wishart – Fish and Wildlife Division, Alberta Energy and Natural Resources

* No longer on SAC

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Report from the Chairman – Mr. Bill Flook

For the year 1983 your Membership Committee consisted of Mrs. Betty Hunter, Ms. Louise Horstman, Mr. Ron Whistance-Smith and myself as chairman.

Meetings were held on January 26 and September 29, and a number of more routine matters were settled by telephone conferences between me and the Committee members on March 14, March 30, and May 13.

The membership list was under constant review throughout the year and updated lists were issued in February, May, August, and November.

During the period the following 33 members resigned from PAC:

Mr. J. Arruda
Ms. L. Bakker
Ms. S. Blazina
Mr. W. Blocksidge
Dr. B.P. Dancik
Ms. J. Dart
Mr. G. Dixson
Mr. D. Dube
Mr. W.J. Francl
Mr. E. Ghostkeeper
Mrs. J. Kelman
Mr. W.L. Kergan
Mr. R. Lightening
Mr. D. MacIsaac
Mr. F.J. Morum
Ms. B. Mundel-Atherstone
Mr. G. Norman
Mrs. M. Oldring
Mrs. B. Paschen
Mr. D. Patching
Mr. R.G. Proudfoot
Mr. R. Rizzoli
Mr. M.K. Ross
Ms. J. Russell
Mr. T. Shewchuk
Mr. M. Slomp
Mr. E. Stolarchuk
Mr. P. Thomas
Mr. S. Thompson
Mr. K. Warren
Mr. R.T. White
Mrs. D. Whitenett
Mr. W. Wismer

To all of these public-spirited volunteers, as well as Dr. H.W. Habgood and Dr. F.W. Schwartz who resigned from SAC, and Mrs. J. Crook, Mr. L. McKibben, Mr. A. Smandych, Mr. G. Shaw, and Mr. B. Westbury who left EEAC, I wish to tender our sincere thanks for their services and best wishes for success in their future endeavors.

Three new associations were added to the growing list of PAC constituents and they supplied members as follows:

Energy Resources Conservation Board – Mr. E. Brushett
Girl Guides of Canada (Alberta Council) – Mrs. T.F. Clement
Health Unit Association of Alberta – Mrs. M. Abdurahman

We also issued invitations to the following groups which have not yet responded:

Boy Scouts of Alberta
City of Fort McMurray
City of Leduc
Leduc Chamber of Commerce
Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce
Medicine Hat Chamber of Commerce
Red Deer Chamber of Commerce
Solar Energy Society

We hope that we will soon be adding their representatives to the ranks of our members.

The Science Advisory Committee added:

Dr. C.B. Beaty
Ms. L. Duncan
Dr. R. Nursall
Dr. W.E. Phillips

The Environment Education Advisory Committee added:

Ms. S. Banks
Dr. L. Fenna
Mrs. C. Gardner
Mr. B. Plesuk
Mr. D. Stoker
Ms. S. Washington

and to all of these new members we wish to offer a sincere welcome.

Each year a number of members whose terms expire are willing to undertake an additional term of service. We feel especially indebted to these public-spirited people and our congratulations and compliments are therefore offered to the following on their re-appointment:

Mr. D. Abbey
Dr. L. Bakshi
Mr. B. Batycky
Mr. E. Berndt
Mr. M. Colledge
Dr. S. Dalton
Dr. R.W. Davies
Prof. P. Dranchuk
Dr. R. Gehrke
Mr. D.A. Gemmill
Mr. R.A. Hill
Dr. A. Lamb
Mrs. D.J. Lewoniuk
Mr. J. Lickacz
Prof. A.R. Lucas
Mrs. M. Lutz
Mr. G.F. Paschen
Mr. P. Seymour
Dr. R. Shaw
Dr. D. Thompson
Dr. T.S. Veeman
Dr. L. Wojtiw

New members added to the unaffiliated members' roster were:

Mrs. D. Broadbent
Mr. D. Broughton
Mr. D. Dube
Ms. J. Hedenstrom
Dr. M. Kostuch
Mr. R.M. Richardson
Mrs. L. Scraba

At the end of the year, the roster stood at 188 members including alternates and unaffiliates, representing 133 separate organizations. Of these, 22 were members of the Science Advisory Committee, 13 were members of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee, 14 were unaffiliated members, and 34 were alternates.

For some time your membership committee has felt that there was insufficient use of alternates to replace regular members who could not attend a meeting. This subject was discussed at length and it was felt that alternate members were probably not being kept sufficiently informed of the current affairs of study groups to feel comfortable when required to attend meetings at short notice.

As a result, the following motion was introduced by Betty Hunter, seconded by Ron Whistance-Smith, and carried by the committee:

That alternates who would like to receive copies of minutes should contact the PAC Secretariat and arrangements will be made to see that they are sent copies of minutes.

You are all therefore requested to advise your alternates of this so that a list of those requesting this service can be assembled and added to the regular distribution lists for the various study groups.

Mr. Bill Flook
Chairman, Membership Committee

ENERGY STUDY GROUP

Report from the Chairman — Mr. Ian Shaw

This study group was reconstituted two years ago under the chairmanship of Mr. Chris Walker. This year, Mr. Walker was obliged to relinquish the position due to employment pressures and Mr. Shaw completed the year as chairman, with Mr. Don Clarke as vice-chairman.

The study group held seven meetings during the year. A program was adopted in which the following priorities were listed:

- regulations re peak power demands
- lowhead power generation
- to become informed on the economics of power and energy
- power conservation
- alternate energy sources.

During the year, we attempted to arrange guest speakers and topics for investigation to conform with our program format. With this objective in mind, we had the following speakers:

Dr. Bernie Luft spoke on the subject of wind turbine pumped hydro systems.

Dr. John Kentfield spoke on wind power and his windmill design. He was joined by Mr. Emil Sandin, an executive of Abax Energy Service of Calgary, a company producing Dr. Kentfield's machine.

Mr. Ron Jones, Manager, Rates and Forecasting for Alberta Power, spoke on electric power rates, costs of production, how costs are passed to customers and regulations governing the industry.

Dr. W.A. Ross addressed the subject of soft energy paths, including the subject of alternate fuels.

All these speakers contributed excellent presentations and enhanced their talks with interesting slides, films, and graphs.

We investigated and discussed the following topics:

1) An electric meter attachment for recording peaks in household consumption of power.

2) Alternate fuel sources: peat moss, alcohol, hydrogen, wind/solar power, trees for fuel (tapping the sap from a Brazilian tree).

3) The use of propane in vehicles and house appliances. We discovered there are some questionable practices in the handling of the substance, poor regulations in the use of barbecues in apartment buildings, and a lack of effective inspection in the installations in some vehicles. We drafted a resolution, but withdrew it for further study.

4) The City of Edmonton proposal to implement an energy conservation information centre.

5) The film BLEVE (boiling liquid expanding vapor explosion) was reviewed.

6) The K-Cycle Engine, designed by a Winnipeg engineer.

7) CLM (coal liquid mixture). This subject was prompted by a newspaper article "Water Doesn't Burn." Dr. C.E. Capes of the National Research Council supplied considerable information on this subject but we did not receive same in time to discuss it.

We had an invitation to attend a demonstration of wind machines at Lethbridge in August, but due to holidays were unable to attend.

The Energy Study Group has had only nine members at the most during the past two years. The attendance at meetings was usually 50 percent or less with the exception of two meetings. Efforts to attract additional members from other groups or outside were of no avail.

It was decided at the November 4, 1983 meeting that the chairman would request the Co-ordinating Committee to consider the future of this group.

As Chairman of the Energy Study Group, I sincerely thank the staff of the ECA for their excellent help, co-operation, and encouragement in making this

a viable study group. I especially thank those members of the study group who attended the meetings and provided enthusiasm and direction in our programs and deliberations.

Mr. Ian Shaw
Chairman, Energy Study Group

Members of the Energy Study Group

Mr. I.D.F. Shaw (Chairman) – Unaffiliated
Mrs. S. Abercrombie – Unaffiliated
Mr. G. Cameron – Edmonton Chamber of Commerce
Mr. D.A. Clarke – S.A.I.T.
Mrs. J. Finlay – Outdoors Unlittered
Mr. R. Ireland – YWCA
Mr. D. MacIsaac* – University of Alberta, Students' Union
Mr. J.E. Staples – Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta
Mr. R.D. Tarleck – City of Lethbridge
Mr. Chris Walker – Alberta Association Canadian Institute of Planners
Mrs. P. Weber+ – Outdoors Unlittered

* No longer on study group
\+ Attended study group as alternate

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION STUDY GROUP

Report from the Chairman – Dr. Guy S. Swinnerton

Dr. Guy S. Swinnerton was re-elected as chairman of the study group at the November 1982 meeting. The election together with the decision that the program theme for the study group in 1983 would be the Slave River hydro-electric project took place after the 1982 annual report went to press. At a subsequent meeting in 1983, Mr. Bob Richardson was re-elected as vice-chairman. The November 1982 meeting was addressed by Mrs. Deirdre Griffiths who at that time was co-ordinator of the Slave River Coalition. Her presentation provided a very informative and timely introduction to the environmental issues associated with the Slave River project and set the scene for the study group's 1983 program.

The study group met on eight occasions during the year. Four of the meetings featured guest speakers and the specific topics discussed are outlined below. One of the problems encountered by the study group in pursuing its program theme was ironically the 'slowness' with which the Slave River project proposal developed. As a result, invited guest speakers frequently had to postpone the dates of their respective presentations until a more significant point had been reached in the discussions between the provincial and federal governments over the project. Moreover, the study group itself has been somewhat restricted in terms of the specific action it has been able to take because of delays in the release of information including the final guidelines for the preparation of the environmental impact assessment. Nevertheless, the study group itself has greatly benefitted from the presentations it did receive on the subject and is much better informed to be able to respond to the environmental issues associated with the project if and when it goes ahead.

Four of the monthly meetings during the year took place without guest speakers but the extra time available on these occasions was used to advantage to discuss relevant issues in greater detail than would otherwise have been the case. The four meetings which featured guest speakers dealt with the following topics.

1) February 4, 1983: (a combined meeting of the Environment Protection Study Group and the Energy Study Group). Mr. Carl Primus, Director, Planning Division, Department of Environment spoke on the topic "the Slave River Hydro-electric Project" from the perspective of the provincial government's involvement.

2) May 16, 1983: Mr. Bob Greyell, Executive Secretary, Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO) addressed the issue of the Slave River hydro-electric project in terms of an explanation of the federal environmental assessment review process, the role of the Slave River Assessment Panel and the complex nature of the federal/provincial interface in the matter.

3) June 20, 1983: Dr. A.H. MacPherson, Regional Director General, Western and Northern Region, Environment Canada; Mr. Mel R. Falk, Parks Canada, Natural Resource Conservation - Prairie Region, and Mr. Gerry Townsend, Western and Northern Region, Canadian Wildlife Service spoke on the responsibilities of Environment Canada regarding the Slave River hydro-electric project and particularly the ecological significance of the Peace-Athabasca Delta and the implications of the project in relation to Wood Buffalo National Park.

4) October 24, 1983: Mr. Tom Mill, Alberta Energy and Natural Resources, Chairman, Special Committee for the Review of Wildlife and Environmental Matters, the Olympic Secretariat, Alberta Recreation and Parks spoke on wildlife and environmental matters associated with the selection of Mount Allan as the site for the downhill events in the 1988 Olympic Winter Games.

With reference to the issue of the proposed Slave River hydro-electric project, the Environment Protection Study Group has written to the Mackenzie River Basin Committee recommending that the committee undertake a systematic analysis of the ecological data relating to the impacts of the W.A.C. Bennett Dam on the Peace-Athabasca Delta. It is believed that such a study could provide valuable background material for the assessment of the potential effects of the proposed Slave River hydro-electric project. As a

result of the October meeting on the selection of Mount Allan as the proposed site for the downhill events in the 1988 Olympic Winter Games, correspondence has taken place with the relevant provincial government departments expressing concern over the level of effective public involvement in the planning process and apparent lack of sufficient base-line information and plans for monitoring the effect of any development on the local environment in general and particularly on the bighorn sheep herd.

During the year, correspondence has also taken place with the relevant government departments regarding proposals to drill sour gas wells in the Prime Protection Zone of the Eastern Slopes, the preservation of Willmore Wilderness, concern over the low level of consideration given to the non-consumptive value of wildlife and wildlife habitats in the fish and wildlife policy for Alberta; and recreational access to the Bow River.

The study group has not prepared any formal resolutions this year. This decision was made on the basis that it was felt that this year the group could more effectively deal with some of the above issues through direct contact with the relevant government departments. As this report goes to press it is anticipated that the November 1983 meeting of the study group will be focussed on the Willmore Wilderness and at the January 1984 session, the fish and wildlife policy will be examined with representatives from the relevant government departments being guest speakers on both occasions.

As chairman of the study group, I should like to express my sincere thanks to those active study group members who have supported the program over the past year and specifically my vice-chairman, Bob Richardson. Grateful appreciation is also extended to the ECA staff, particularly Randalin Pretty and Bill Flook for their support and guidance in making 1983 another constructive and rewarding year for the Environment Protection Study Group.

Dr. Guy S. Swinnerton
Chairman, Environment Protection Study Group

Members of the Environment Protection Study Group

Dr. G.S. Swinnerton (Chairman) – National and Provincial Parks Association, (Edmonton Chapter)
Ms. M. Abdurahman – Health Unit Association of Alberta
Mrs. S. Abercrombie – Unaffiliated
Mrs. L. Allison – Foothills Protective Association
Mr. J. Arruda* – Canadian Union College, Student's Association
Ms. S. Blazina* – Olds College Students' Council
Mrs. D. Broadbent – Unaffiliated
Dr. R. Cairns – Alberta Institute of Agrologists
Mr. A. Chanin – Calgary Chamber of Commerce
Mrs. T.F. Clement – Girl Guides of Canada
Mr. B. Cole+ – Northern Alberta Association of Biological Science Technicians
Mr. G. Dixson* – Western Stock Growers' Association
Mr. C. Fabris – Red Deer College
Dr. R. Gehrke – Alberta Chiropractic Association
Mr. J. Glazier – Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties
Dr. G. Griffiths+ – National and Provincial Parks Association, (Edmonton Chapter)
Mr. E. Ghostkeeper* – Federation of Metis Settlements
Mr. E. Jarvis – Western Stock Growers' Association
Mrs. P. Kariel – Sierra Club of Alberta
Mr. B. Kolenosky – Northern Alberta Association of Biological Science Technicians
Mrs. J. Krabbe – Citizens for Public Justice
Mr. J. Laurence+ – Sierra Club of Alberta
Mrs. B. Laychuk – Calgary Local Council of Women
Mr. R. Lightning* – Indian Association of Alberta
Mr. R.P. McKenzie – Alberta Beekeepers' Association
Prof. B.J. Mundel-Atherstone* – University of Lethbridge
Mrs. O. Meyers+ – Alberta Women's Institutes
Mr. R.E. Nielsen – Alberta Federation of Labour
Mr. R. Proudfoot* – N.A.I.T.
Mr. R. Richardson – Unaffiliated
Mrs. K. Russell – Women of Unifarm
Dr. R. Scace – Unaffiliated
Mr. P. Seymour – University of Alberta
Mr. M. Slomp+ – Citizens for Public Justice
Mr. E. Stolarchuk* – Keyano College
Ms. E. Wilson+ – Calgary Local Council of Women
Mrs. D. Whitenett* – Alberta Women's Institute

* No longer on study group
\+ Attended study group as alternate

NON-RENEWABLE RESOURCES STUDY GROUP

Report from the Chairman – Mrs. Betty Hunter

Since I became chairman in January 1983, our study group has had ten meetings: eight regular, one telephone conference discussing a resolution for the December conference, and one field trip to the Sundance plant at Wabamun.

Our emphasis this year has been on coal, prompted by the increased

activity in the Coal Branch area south of Hinton.

January 4, we heard from Mr. Marvin Dudas, Soil Sciences, University of Alberta on "By-Products of Coal," with emphasis on fly ash, and the process by which fly and bottom ash are produced and the possible uses of same.

February 1, our guest speaker was Dr. Norbert Berkowitz, on "Alternate Uses of Coal" – the conversion of coal to synthetic gases to synthetic hydrocarbons, to solvent-refined coal.

March 1, we heard Mr. A. Slessor from Trans Alta Fly Ash. He was to be one of our hosts and guides on our field trip in September. His samples of fly ash and bottom ash were appreciated as was his talk on the properties and uses of ash. At this and the January meeting, we had as our guest Mr. Roy McBride, who had made practical use of fly ash.

April 5, a very interesting and well-illustrated talk with slides, etc. on "Strip Mining and Pit Mining" was given by one of our members, Mr. Ken Crane from Luscar coal company. This was a good background, as were the January and March meetings, for our September field trip.

May 3, our topic "Application Process in the Development of a New Mine" was handled by a panel. Mr. Bob Patterson, Manager of the Coal Department of the ERCB, spoke on the approval process of coal development and later the reclamation certification. Mr. Ken Crane, Luscar Ltd., illustrated the involved regulated coal industry – a complex system, but one that works well. Mr. David Bartley, Town Manager, Hinton, outlined the role of the Town in the approval process. As with all our speakers, a discussion period followed each speaker.

At the June 7 meeting, we left the subject of coal and had Dr. Douglas Cameron, Chemist with Turbo Manufacturing – his topic, "The Recycling of Lube Oil." Using interesting slides, Dr. Cameron told of the beginning and gradual growth of the re-refining industry at the Turbo plant.

July 22 – a telephone conference. Members participated. We discussed the resolution on the recycling of used lubricating oil, written primarily by Professor Bev Mundel-Atherstone and Horst Fauser, two members of our study group. We had an interesting discussion (the resolution had been circulated). Corrections, deletions, and additions were agreed upon with a presentation at our September meeting before taking the resolution to the Co-ordinating Committee.

As mentioned before, our September meeting was a field trip, a tour of the Sundance power plant at Wabamun. We held most of our business meeting in the mini-bus at Beach Corner waiting for our guide, Mr. Al Slessor. We had a very interesting, informative tour of Pit No. 4, the reclamation of Pit No. 3 (now mined out), the power plant, and the fly ash operation at Sundance.

At the October 3 meeting, we took a different view of coal mining: "The Layman's View of Coal Mining." Three citizens had had the actual experience of the possibility of a coal mine on their property:

Mr. Davies of the Wabamun Homeowners Association and a knowledgeable group of cottagers who were successful in having plans for the expansion of a mine deterred, to be more compatible with their holdings.

Mrs. Lorna Smith of Alix told of how an organization of concerned citizens 'starting from scratch' gathered enough information and support to stop or delay a strip mining operation in their area.

Mr. Kobernick, a frustrated farmer from near the Geneva-Keephills project, was not happy with his or his neighbors' experiences. "Too much farmland taken out of production for, as yet, no use."

At our November 1 meeting, we will have a panel of three: Mr. Herb Kalmacoff, Hub Oil, Calgary; Tom Rogers, Pollution Control Division, Department of the Environment, and Ms. Jillian Flett of the Environmental Law Centre. These speakers, we hope, will add to our information on the recycling of oil, present regulations, etc., thus giving our group guidance on necessary incentives, possible legislation, or regulations to save more of this non-renewable resource.

Mr. Don Broughton, one of our members, presented our study group's brief on the agriculture land base at the ECA hearings in Calgary in early October.

Mrs. Betty Hunter
Chairman, Non-Renewable Resources Study Group

Members of the Non-Renewable Resources Study Group

Mrs. E.S. Hunter (Chairman) – Consumers' Association of Canada
Mr. H.O. Anderson+ – Archaeological Society of Alberta
Mr. N.D. Bankes+ – Law Society of Alberta
Mr. W.D. Broughton* – Oil Sands Environmental Study Group
Mr. G. Cameron – Edmonton Chamber of Commerce
Mr. A. Dickson* – United Grain Growers Limited
Mr. G.T. Dudley – Alberta Irrigation Projects Association
Mr. A.C. Dunkley – National and Provincial Parks Association, Calgary/Banff Chapter
Mr. H. Fauser – Alberta Fish and Game Association
Mr. R. Gladish+ – Alberta Fish and Game Association
Mr. R. Jensen+ – Alberta Irrigation Projects Association
Dr. A. Lamb – Alberta Chamber of Commerce
Professor A.R. Lucas – Law Society of Alberta
Professor B.J. Mundel-Atherstone* – University of Lethbridge
Dr. D.H. Norrie – University of Calgary
Mrs. B. Paschen* – Unaffiliated

Mr. G.F. Paschen – Archaeological Society of Alberta
Mr. R. Paul – Native Outreach
Mr. J. Prostebby+ – Electric Utility Planning Council
Mr. M.K. Ross* – Coal Association of Alberta
Mrs. M. Stephensen – Alberta School Trustees Association
Mr. G. Stewart – Canada Petroleum Association
Mr. K. Warren* – Electric Utility Planning Council

* No longer on study group
+ Attended study group as alternate

POLLUTION STUDY GROUP

Report from the Chairman – Dr. Lubomir Wojtiw

The Pollution Study Group held 11 meetings in 1983. During the year, the group addressed a number of topics, the two main subjects being: (a) air pollution, the Lodgepole blowout, and the Pincher Creek/Twin Butte issue, and (b) water quality in Alberta rivers. A list of the meetings, topics, and speakers is included at the end of this report, as well as a list of the members who attended 1983 meetings.

The Pollution Study Group meetings were very well attended by the members, and because of the members' enthusiasm, 1983 has been a successful and productive year for the group. A number of meetings had extensive news media coverage; generating excellent public exposure for topics addressed by the group. The Pincher Creek/Twin Butte issue has continued to be a concern to the study group. Several meetings were devoted to this topic and the study group still advocates that a comprehensive health study is necessary for the area. The results of the SAGE analysis (released 4 July 1983) also support this viewpoint, recommending that the Government of Alberta undertake such a study as soon as possible. The Pollution Study Group not only has supported the recommendations from the SAGE committee, but has now asked that the Government of Alberta make funds available to carry out the committee's recommendations.

The study group has also been very active with the Lodgepole blowout. After extensive discussions, the study group received funding from the ERCB to hire consultants to do an environmental study for the Lodgepole blowout. Monenco Consultants of Calgary were hired to conduct the $140,000 study, comprising two phases: Phase I consisted of identification of zones of impingement from the blowout, while Phase II consisted of the study of terrestrial and aquatic vegetation, organism testing, and sulphur and lichen analysis. The funding was administered through the Pollution Study Group. The consultants presented and prepared a report of their findings to the study group. This report was submitted on behalf of PAC to the Lodgepole inquiry panel in the middle of September. This is the first time that a public advisory committee was able to obtain funding of this magnitude to conduct a study into issues of concern to the public. The Pollution Study Group appointed Dr. Martha Kostuch to be in charge of the Lodgepole blowout study on the group's behalf. The study group would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Kostuch for her efforts and the successful completion of the project.

The issue of water quality in Alberta was also discussed extensively through the year by the study group. Two areas in which the group expressed concern to the Minister of Environment were Drumheller water quality and the Procter and Gamble issue.

The group has also been active in a number of other issues – the reader should refer to the minutes of the meetings of the Pollution Study Group for an in-depth summary.

I would like to thank the members of the Pollution Study Group, the ECA staff, and the news media for their support and assistance in making 1983 a successful year for the group.

Dr. Lubomir Wojtiw
Chairman, Pollution Study Group

Members Attending Pollution Study Group Meetings in 1983

Mr. D. Abbey
Mr. B. Alleyne
Mr. K. Blom
Mr. E.R. Brushett
Ms. P. Campbell
Mr. N. Carlson
Dr. M. Chaudhry
Dr. K. Cummins
Mr. J. Dilay
Mr. D.A. Gemmill
Dr. G. Griffiths
Ms. J. Hedenstrom
Dr. K. Hodgins
Mr. W. Irwin
Dr. C. Konschuh
Dr. M. Kostuch
Mr. G. Lane
Mr. T. Lau
Ms. J. Lewin
Mr. B. Lutz
Mr. G. Lunty
Mr. G. Merrick
Mr. F.J. Morum
Mr. A.D. Oliver
Ms. J. Roschlaub
Mr. W.K. Ross
Mrs. L. Scraba
Dr. R.K. Shaw
Mr. J. Shemanchuk

Members of the Pollution Study Group

Dr. L. Wojtiw (Chairman) – Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society
Mr. D. Abbey – Canadian Union College

Mr. B. Alleyne+ – Alberta Public Health Association
Mr. K. Blom – Alberta Public Health Association
Mr. E.R. Brushett – Energy Resources Conservation Board
Mrs. P. Campbell – University Women's Club of Edmonton (Canadian Federation)
Mr. N. Carlson – City of Wetaskiwin
Dr. M.H. Chaudhry – Lakeland College – Vermilion Campus
Mr. G. Chronik+ – Alberta Fish and Game Association
Dr. K. Cummins – Mount Royal College
Mr. J. Dilay+ – Energy Resources Conservation Board
Mr. S. Dymianiw+ – Canadian Institute of Public Health Inspectors (Alberta Branch)
Mr. D.A. Gemmill – Chemical Institute of Canada – Canadian Society of Chemical Engineers (Calgary Section)
Dr. G.C.D. Griffiths – Unaffiliated
Ms. J. Hedenstrom – Alberta Wilderness Association
Dr. K.W. Hodgins – Alberta Medical Association
Mr. W. Irwin – Canadian Institute of Public Health Inspectors (Alberta Branch)
Ms. J. Kennedy+ – Alberta Wilderness Association
Dr. C. Konschuh – Alberta Veterinary Medical Association
Dr. M. Kostuch – Unaffiliated
Mr. G. Lane – Mount Royal College Students' Association
Mr. T. Lau – Strathcona Industrial Association
Ms. J. Lewin – City of Calgary
Mrs. D.J. Lewoniuk – Alberta Lung Association
Mr. H.G. Lunty – United Farmers of Alberta Co-operative Ltd.
Mr. G. Merrick – Alberta Fish and Game Association
Mr. F.J. Morum – Fort Saskatchewan Regional Industrial Association
Mr. G. Norman* – Strathcona Industrial Association
Mr. A.D. Oliver+ – Fort Saskatchewan Regional Industrial Association
Ald. C. Reid+ – City of Calgary
Mr. R. Romanetz – City of Drumheller
Mrs. J. Roschlaub – Alberta Pharmaceutical Association
Mr. W.K. Ross – Unaffiliated
Mr. H. Rowland+ – Alberta Lung Association
Ms. J. Russell* – N.A.I.T. Students' Association
Mrs. L. Scraba* – Women of Unifarm
Dr. R.K. Shaw – Medicine Hat College
Mr. J.A. Shemanchuk – Entomological Society of Alberta
Mr. R.T. White* – Bow River Water Users Association

* No longer on study group
+ Attended study group as alternate

RENEWABLE RESOURCES STUDY GROUP

Report from the Chairman – Dr. Charlie Wood

The study group met ten times during 1983. In January, Doug Patching resigned as vice-chairman (and also resigned from PAC due to the burdens of work and travel from Lethbridge). Mrs. Elsie Friesen was elected to succeed Doug as vice-chairman and served as acting chairman during my vacation in February.

The study group's areas of interest for the year included:

1) health and safety of farmers using pesticides (left over from 1982)

2) municipal solid waste and hazardous waste (begun in 1982)

3) land use (begun in 1983 and possibly 1984's main area of interest)

4) water resource management.

As a follow-up to last year's work and resolution "Health Surveillance for Farmers Using Pesticides", Dr. Moe Hussain, Pesticide Issues Co-ordinator, Alberta Agriculture visited our January and April meetings to report on his efforts to improve pesticide information and related services available to farmers. Several of the concerns expressed in our resolution were reflected in the new information available to farmers from Alberta Agriculture.

Last year's preliminary interest in municipal solid waste, brought to our attention by former Edmonton Alderman Gerry Wright and the late Lethbridge Councilman Bill Kergan, one of our study group members, developed through the year into our major area of concern. Our meetings were attended at different times by Mr. Ken Simpson, Head, Waste Management Branch, Alberta Environment; and Alderman Wright. The chairman also consulted at length with John Sworder and Gene Bolstad, Edmonton Consulting Engineers, who specialize in Solid Waste Management, as well as the ECA's research officers. These efforts resulted in two resolutions prepared for presentation at this year's annual joint meeting and a lengthy letter sent to the Mayor of Edmonton.

The letter to Mayor Decore of Edmonton urged him to consider such options as incineration and resource recovery in the course of the city's current study of alternative methods for disposal of municipal solid waste. One of the resolutions urges Alberta Environment and the City of Edmonton to consider a joint site for an MSW incinerator and the proposed hazardous waste disposal facility to be possibly located in or near Edmonton. This idea is being well received on a preliminary basis by some authorities in the Strathcona area who are anxious to avoid hauling their wastes long distances.

The subject of water resources management also received a great deal of

attention this year. Our May meeting was attended by Mr. Walter Solodzuk, Deputy Minister of Environment; Mr. Eugene Kupchanko, Assistant Deputy Minister, Environmental Protection Services; and Mr. Peter Melnychuk, Assistant Deputy Minister, Water Resources Management Services. All three described various aspects of provincial water management and addressed such issues as assimilative capacity of rivers, water quality, and inter-provincial allocations.

Our July meeting consisted of a field trip to the newly completed Dixon Dam on the Red Deer River where we were able to view the facility and ask questions of those in charge.

Suggested topics for next year's meetings include:

1) water resources management,

2) land use (Since the study group's membership includes farmers, trappers, hunters, foresters, etc., a wide spectrum of land use interests is represented.)

3) upcoming revisions to the Wildlife Act,

4) wind power and its relationship to other power sources,

5) the impact of clear cutting on trapping and other forest uses.

I would like to thank all the study group members who enthusiastically attended meetings and continually contributed widely varied ideas and opinions. Particular thanks are due to Mrs. Carol Hooks (she had to resign late in the year because of the demands of her job) for her enthusiastic input on occupational health issues in particular, and the activities of the group in general.

I would also like to thank the ECA staff: Bill Flook and Ken Nelson for their continuous input of ideas and constructive criticisms of our proceeding, Cal Webb for his help on the solid waste issue, Randy Pretty for keeping everything organized and running smoothly, and Joyce Degelder and Elaine Kaiser who did all our typing and other secretarial work in a very cheerful and uncomplaining way.

Dr. Charlie Wood
Chairman, Renewable Resources Study Group

Members of the Renewable Resources Study Group

Dr. C. Wood (Chairman) – Alberta Research Council
Mr. D. Appleby – Cold Lake Community Advisory Committee
Mr. E.B. Cunningham – Lethbridge Community College
Ms. J. Dart* – Lethbridge Community College, Students' Association
Mr. P. Dobson – Alberta Wheat Pool
Mr. T. Donkersgoed+ – Unifarm
Mr. D. Dube* – Canadian Institute of Forestry
Mr. D. Ealey+ – Canadian Nature Federation
Mr. J. Eisenhauer – Alberta Wilderness Association
Mr. W.J. Francl* – Canadian Water Resources Association (Alberta Chapter)
Mrs. E. Friesen – Unifarm (Broiler Board Rep)
Mr. A. Garbutt – Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists (Alberta Chapter)
Mr. H. Gardner – Federation of Alberta Naturalists
Mr. R. Hawkesworth – Alberta Urban Municipalities Association
Mr. R.A. Hill – Olds College
Mrs. C. Hooks* – Alberta Association of Registered Nurses
Ms. L. Horstman+ – Canadian Society of Environmental Biologists (Alberta Chapter)
Mr. W.L. Kergan* – City of Lethbridge
Mr. E. Kure – Unaffiliated
Mr. J. Lickacz – Fairview College
Mr. B. MacDonald – Grande Prairie Chamber of Commerce
Mr. D. Patching* – Unaffiliated
Mr. D. Peters+ – Olds College
Ms. M. Posey – Canadian Nature Federation
Mr. R. Prins+ – Christian Farmers Federation
Mr. R. Rizzoli* – Alberta Trappers' Association
Mr. A. Rytz – Alberta Forest Products Association
Mr. T. Shewchuk* – Grande Prairie Regional College
Mr. G. Sykes – Canadian Water Resources Association (Alberta Chapter)
Mr. P. Thomas* – Alberta Institute of Agrologists
Mr. C. Wallis+ – Alberta Wilderness Association
Mr. R. Whistance-Smith – University of Alberta
Mr. A. Wierenga – Christian Farmers Federation

* No longer on study group
+ Attended study group as alternate

URBAN ENVIRONMENT STUDY GROUP

Report from the Chairman – Dr. Lochan Bakshi

The membership of the Urban Environment Study Group increased during the year from 11 in January to 13 in December. In late 1982, the study group had elected me as chairman and Marcelle Lutz as vice-chairman. We both

continued in those positions during 1983.

I am happy to report that the year has seen a marked improvement in our attendance at the meetings. About half of the meetings had over 90 percent of the members present.

As is customary, I as chairman represented the study group at the Co-ordinating Committee meetings, and in my absence, Marcelle Lutz represented the group.

In early 1983, Sheri Dalton participated on our behalf in the meetings of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee. When time constraints prevented her from doing so, I represented the study group at the EEAC deliberations for the rest of the year.

The study group considered several issues during the year, with special emphasis on the impact of urban growth on the outlying areas and on the city dwellers. Topics discussed included the recycling of shopping centres, the recommendations of the public hearings on noise in Alberta, fireplace pollution, and the fate of single industry communities.

The recommendations of the noise panel were discussed in three meetings. First, the panel chairman Roy McBride presented the recommendations to the study group and brought us up to date on the developments since the publication of the panel's report. The group then met in Calgary to hear the noise policy of the City of Calgary in relation to the report. This was followed by a third meeting in Edmonton to hear the views of the Capital City. All these discussions resulted in our preparing a resolution supporting the establishment of a Quiet Communities Directorate.

The fate of single industry communities was discussed at two meetings. The study group was concerned about the new developments at Hinton and in the Kananaskis country, and the members wanted to make sure that these developments will not lead to the ultimate "fall" of the two areas in a manner similar to that of Grande Cache. Our deliberations resulted in the drafting of a resolution on the topic.

The cause of fireplace pollution was ably presented to us by Alan Smith, a member of our study group. A resolution on this topic is also being drafted.

To assist the members in getting involved further in the work of the study group, we invited Dan Stoker to speak to us on the topic "Methodology for Dealing with Projects/Actions/Resolutions." Dan is a member of the Environmental Education Advisory Committee, and he made a thought-provoking presentation. We hope to adopt his suggestions in 1984.

Our study group had a very interesting and successful year in which we learned a lot about several specific topics. As shown by our high attendance rate, which was almost perfect on several occasions, the members are very enthusiastic about the work of the study group. I want to thank them for their very active participation throughout the year.

The work of our study group would not have been accomplished without the help of the ECA staff of whom I must single out two persons. Bill Flook was a source of strength to us in every meeting. His encyclopedic knowledge and his command of English guided us through many difficult moments. And where would we be without the assistance of Randy Pretty, the Executive Secretary? Her thoroughness, competence, and friendliness took care of the group's burdens throughout the year. So my sincere thanks and appreciation go to Bill and Randy.

I deeply regret that I will not be present at our annual meeting at Banff. At that time I will be with my mother, about 300 km north of New Delhi in India. I will no doubt be enjoying the plus-twenty-degree weather, but I promise to think about you all at Banff where your numerous activities are sure to keep you warm.

I wish you all a very happy time during the Christmas season, and a very fruitful 1984.

Dr. Lochan Bakshi
Chairman, Urban Environment Study Group

Members of the Urban Environment Study Group

Dr. L. Bakshi (Chairman) – Athabasca University
Mrs. L. Bakker* – City of St. Albert
Mr. E.J. Blais+ – City of Grande Prairie
Mr. M.J. Colledge – Alberta Motor Association
Dr. S. Dalton – Concordia College
Mrs. N. Dawson+ – Council of Alberta Rural Ratepayer's Association
Mr. K. Driver – Unaffiliated
Mr. J.C. Finlay – Council of Alberta Rural Ratepayer's Association
Mr. R. Fodchuk+ – Alberta Association of Landscape Architects
Dr. K. Higginbotham – City of Edmonton
Mrs. J. Kelman* – City of Calgary
Mrs. L. Klute+ – Alberta Motor Association
Prof. H. Knowles – Alberta Association of Landscape Architects
Mrs. M. Lutz – Consumers Association of Canada
Mr. D.M. Myrehaug – City of Camrose
Mr. K. Newman+ – City of Edmonton
Mrs. M. Oldring* – Urban Development Institute of Alberta
Mr. T. Priddle – Urban Development Institute of Alberta
Mr. E. Radbourne – City of Grande Prairie
Mrs. P. Reschenthaller+ – Concordia College
Mr. P. Rudiak – Keyano College
Mrs. J. Sloan – City of Lloydminster
Mr. A. Smith – City of St. Albert
Dr. I. Taylor+ – Athabasca University
Mrs. R. Wood+ – Consumers Association of Canada

* No longer on study group
\+ Attended study group as alternate

ECA RESEARCH DIVISION

The Research Division is one of the three divisions of the Environment Council of Alberta; the others are Administration and Liaison. The division is staffed by a research director (Dave Buchwald), five senior environmental research officers (John Lilley, Tom Cottrell, Peggy Thompson, Mike Kelly, Mary Gordon), and three environmental research officers (Cal Webb, Kim Sanderson, Brian Free). The group is interdisciplinary in nature. Its major function is to provide technical support to all the council's activities. This centres upon the responsibility to carry out an ongoing review of provincial environmental policies and programs. Such reviews are achieved through public hearings, the activities of the Public Advisory Committee, and through staff reports.

Public Hearings

Activities supportive of a public hearing normally pass through several stages. They are:

a) Preparation of the background information. This involves the creation of technical and summary reports used in the prehearing information program. Usually about 75 percent of the reports are written by research staff, 10 to 15 percent by consultants under the supervision of research officers, and the remainder by provincial government agencies.

b) Distribution of background information to the public. This usually takes six to eight months. The program involves all divisions of the council. Normally, the Research Division commits two or three research officers to this part of the program, although additional research staff may become involved if necessary.

c) Appointment of the hearing panel and holding the hearings. Research officers assigned to the topic attend all hearings and do a detailed content analysis of all information presented. This becomes the basis for the brief referencing system, which can be found in all ***Reports and Recommendations*** since the Oldman River hearings.

d) Preparation of the report and recommendations. Research officers are assigned to a hearing and assist the panel in the development of the report and recommendations by supplying a full range of research assistance to panel members. Research officers are assigned to a particular hearing and assist in retaining detailed knowledge of the background as well as the report and recommendations relating to a hearing topic within the ECA, even after a panel has disbanded. This facilitates follow-up inquiries in subsequent years.

Each hearing usually has a senior research officer assigned to it, plus one or more additional research officers. The total staff commitment depends on the magnitude of the topic. The assigned research officers work on a hearing topic through all its stages. Past and present hearing assignments are:

Oldman River	John Lilley
Hazardous Wastes	John Lilley Mike Kelly
Noise	Tom Cottrell Mary Gordon
Maintaining and Expanding the Agricultural Land Base in Alberta	Peggy Thompson Mike Kelly Cal Webb Kim Sanderson

The research director, Dave Buchwald, participates in all public hearings and the subsequent preparation of the report and recommendations.

Agriculture Hearings

In 1983, the last of the reports and summaries for the agriculture hearings were completed. A complete listing of the reports and summaries is given at the end of this document. There are 31 reports covering 20 topic areas. These documents provide a wide range of information in two forms: technical reports that reflect a thorough approach to the topic, and summaries that present the major points and issues of the subject, written for a general audience. These documents have received wide distribution; approximately 58,000 copies had been distributed as of September 30, 1983.

The prehearing information program began in 1982. In March, 1983, the terms of reference were received and the panel was appointed. Public information meetings were held in six locations, in addition to the 69 meetings held in 1982. Three types of displays were set up in many locations throughout the province. The Environment Council's film, entitled ***Tomorrow's Bread,*** describes the agriculture hearing content. It was borrowed by many groups in 1983. Numerous contacts were established with a wide range of organizations and individuals interested in the agricultural land base issues.

The public hearings are just concluding. They were held in 17 locations, commencing in Fort Vermilion on July 28, 1983, and finishing in Edmonton in early December 1983.

Assistance to the Public Advisory Committee

Research assistance is provided to PAC within the constraints of ongoing programs. Substantive assistance is initiated by a request from the Co-ordinating Committee to the Chief Executive Officer. In addition, there is an ongoing commitment to provide technical commentary on proposed PAC resolutions.

The major research assistance to PAC in 1983 was the preparation of a report, ***The Use of Municipal Waste as Fuel***, by Cal Webb. This was to assist the deliberations of the Renewable Resources Study Group.

Policy and Program Review

As of the end of 1983, several complex reports are in the final stages. They are:

Water Quality Management in Alberta, J. Lilley.
This is an assessment of The Clean Water Act, its administration, and its underlying philosophy.

Managing Air Quality in Alberta, M. Gordon and B. Free.
This is an assessment of The Clean Air Act, its administration, and its underlying philosophy.

The ERCB: Its Environmental Role and Relationship, M. Gordon.
This describes the role of the Energy Resources Conservation Board in environmental decision making, particularly in relation to other provincial agencies.

Acid-Forming Emissions – Transportation and Effects, K. Sanderson.
This report discusses some of the major issues relating to acid-forming emissions.

Reports completed and published in 1983 were:

Environmental Standards: A Comparative Study of Canadian Standards, Standard Setting Processes and Enforcement, M.A.H. Franson, R.T. Franson, and A.R. Lucas, 1983.
Supervision of this consultant's contract was provided by John Lilley.
This report assesses Alberta's environmental standards against those of other Canadian jurisdictions.

Wildlife Roadkills and Potential Mitigation in Alberta, K. Sanderson.
This report looks at the seriousness of roadkill problems in Alberta and possible mitigative techniques.

Conclusion

The above summarizes Research Division activity with regard to the public hearings, PAC, and policy and program review. Several research officers are in attendance at this meeting; please feel free to contact them or myself, if you wish to pursue any aspect of research operations.

Dave Buchwald
Director, Research, Environment Council of Alberta

POOR

QUALITY

ORIGINAL